THE AFFIRMATIVE PARTICLES IN FRENCH

By

JOHN GORDON ANDISON

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University

3781
C72A
UNCLASSED
Dissertation

THE AFFIRMATIVE PARTICLES IN FRENCH

THE AFFIRMATIVE PARTICLES IN FRENCH

By

JOHN GORDON ANDISON

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
1923

CONTENTS

PAGE

Preface 9

CHAPTER I

Introduction and Historical Survey 11

CHAPTER II

Affirmative Locutions in Latin 23

CHAPTER III

The Affirmative in Old French (*oïl* paradigm) 39

CHAPTER IV

The Affirmative in Old French (*si, si fait*) 85

CHAPTER V

Conclusion 97

Bibliography 103

Vita 104

PREFACE

The possibilities which the Particles of Affirmation in Old French might offer in the way of philological study and original research were first suggested to me by Prof. H. A. Todd during one of a course of lectures on Romance Philology given by him in Columbia University in the Spring Session of 1920. My interest in Romance Philology had been awakened from the beginning of the course and I welcomed an opportunity of carrying on specialized work in this field of investigation. Upon returning to pursue my studies the following autumn I became a member of Prof. Todd's Saturday morning research class and began delving into the subject set forth in the following pages. Preparatory investigation was conducted and reports were made that year in Columbia University, but the results were not assembled in the present form until the spring of 1922 at the University of Toronto.

With regard to the textual quotations which I have used throughout this study, I regret to say that they are not always those of the most authoritative editions. There are two reasons for this, the more important of which is that during my first year's work my acquaintance with the bibliography of the texts was somewhat rudimentary; in the second place, to avoid undue delays, I was obliged to content myself with the editions of Old French literature at my disposal. I might add, however, that it is not likely there is in the extracts quoted any incorrect reading, directly affecting the doctrine of the affirmative particles. In many cases I have taken pains to indicate the variant readings in the foot-notes.

I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my

very great gratitude to Prof. H. A. Todd, without whose kindly encouragement and helpful criticism I could not have found confidence to pursue this study or ability to bring it to a conclusion; and to Prof. J. Home Cameron of University College, Toronto, and Prof. H. E. Ford, Victoria College, for their friendly interest and assistance; I wish also to acknowledge the valuable help given me by Prof. H. F. Muller of Columbia University; and by Prof. A. J. Bell of Victoria College, Toronto, who advised me on many points in connection with the chapter on Affirmation in Latin.

J. G. A.

CHAPTER I

A. Introduction

In the following pages an attempt has been made to give a clear and detailed account of how the word *oui*, the affirmative particle in Modern French, came to exist. Its historical development is more complicated than the word for 'yes' either in Provençal (*oc* from Latin HOC) or in Spanish and Italian (*si* from Latin SIC), for *oui* cannot be traced back to any single and detached Latin affirmative word. Rather does it have its origin in a Latin affirmative locution whose use was apparently confined to the dialect of Folk Latin spoken in the northern part of Gaul. This locution stressed the pronoun corresponding to the grammatical subject of the question and therefore varied as to person and number. The particular form which involved the pronoun of the third person, e.g., *il* (Old French form of the nominative case in both singular and plural) was evidently used far more than the forms of the first and second persons. We find therefore that by the time represented in the earliest Old French texts, the commonest form of affirmation in the language was *oïl i.e., o,* (Latin HOC), +*il*. The language itself was called the 'langue d'oïl,' in contrast to that of Southern Gaul, which was the 'langue d'oc.'[1]

In order to make clear the exact relation of these Old French locutions of affirmation to the questions to which they constituted the replies, let us resort to the table given in Darmesteter's *Historical French*

[1] The corresponding English translations of these expressions would be the 'language of *oïl*' and the 'language of *oc*.' The English language thus described would be the 'language of *yes*.'

Grammar (page 383);[1] here a list of questions with subjects in all three persons, singular and plural, is given, with the corresponding word for 'yes' in answer to each. These various forms of affirmation represent the stage of development reached by the original Latin locution at the time of the earlier literary monuments in Old French.

To the question:		
1. *Ai-je bien fait?*		*o tu*
2. *As-tu bien fait?*		*o je*
3. *A-t-il bien fait?*		*o il*
4. *A-t-elle bien fait?*	corresponded	*o ele*
5. *Avons-nous bien fait?*	the answer	*o vos*
6. *Avez-vous bien fait?*		*o nos*
7. *Ont-ils bien fait?*		*o il*
8. *Ont-elles bien fait?*		*o elles*

It will be seen from this table that the Old French affirmatives resemble very closely a familiar English affirmative locution. This enables us to give an almost literal English equivalent for the above forms.[2]

To the question:		
1. *Have I done well?*		*that you have*
2. *Have you done well?*	corresponds	*that I have*
3. *Has he done well?*	the answer	*that he has*
4. *Has she done well?*		*that she has*
etc.		etc.

The various forms of this affirmative involving the first, second and third person pronouns, singular and plural, constitute, when collectively considered, what will henceforth be called in this study "the affirmative *paradigm*." Of this paradigm the only form which

[1] Hartog's translation, Macmillan 1899.

[2] The exact equivalents of the Old French *o je*, *o tu*, etc., are rather *this I*, *this you*, etc., but the similarity still remains striking, and makes the English language a fitting one to convey, by means of a practical illustration, a clear idea of the literal meaning of the affirmative particle in Old French.

has survived is that of the third person, *oïl* (modern *oui*); in fact, most of the other forms are so rarely found that until a comparatively recent date the existence of the so-called "paradigm" was not recognized. It is now accepted by philologists as the original form of affirmation in the French language, but up to the present it has not been studied in historical detail with reference to its occurrence in the texts themselves, and all discussion of it has been of the briefest kind.

B. Historical Survey

Professor Adolf Tobler, under the heading *Französische etymologien*[1] was the first one to draw attention to the original significance of *oïl* as the survival of one of the persons of a paradigm of affirmatives in Old French. He says:

> *Oïl*, which did not originally mean 'c'est cela' as has commonly been supposed, but 'yes he, yes it, yes they (masc.)' comes to mean nothing more than 'yes'; that is, it supplants also those affirmative expressions whose subjects would be 'I, thou, we, you, they (fem.),' just as *nenil*, literally 'not he, not it' supplants the corresponding forms in the negative. *O je* is already pretty well crowded out by it in the Old French period; *o tu*, *o nos*, *o elle*, *o vos* can hardly be found.[2]

Tobler's paragraph, despite its laconic brevity, attracted widespread attention and his position was almost universally accepted. His discussion must form the natural basis of any study dealing with the

[1] *Zeits. f. verg. Sprachf.*, vol. xxiii (1876), p. 423.

[2] The original German runs as follows: "*Oïl*, das ursprünglich keineswegs 'c'est cela' bedeutet, wie allgemein angenommen wird, sondern 'ja er, ja es, ja sie (männl. mehrzahl)' wird zum blossen 'ja,' d.h. es vertritt auch solche bejahende antwortsätze (wie *nenil*, nein er, es, verneinende) welche 'ich, du, wir, ihr, sie (weiblich)' zum subjecte haben würden, und *o je* ist schon in alter Zeit vielfach dadurch verdrängt; *o tu*, *o nos*, *o elle*, *o vos* sind kaum aufzufinden." It will be seen that Tobler has been unable to give the literal translation of *oïl* in German; *oïl* was not originally 'yes he' but 'this he' with the verb understood.

French affirmative, and, as we shall see, excited a keen interest in the subject. Perle for instance, in his study on the *Negation in Old French*,[1] makes a timely alteration in his own reference to the affirmative as a result of Tobler's article:

> *Oïl* is generally considered to be a combination of HOC and ILLUD; correspondingly *nennil* would be derived from NON ILLUD. Tobler is of another opinion. He says that *oïl* is not derived from HOC and ILLUD, but from HOC and ILLE; ILLE (*il*) he considers thereby to be the subject of a verb understood. . . . We consider that the latter view should be accepted.

In the same number of the *Zeitschrift* (p. 171), Foerster takes up the question of the affirmative particle, following out Tobler's theory in more detail, and adding several facts of interest. One of these will receive special emphasis later in this study, namely, that the forms of the paradigm other than those of the third person were always used in conformity with their context, whereas *oïl* had in many cases lost its original meaning and by confusion had been substituted for the other forms.[2]

Gaston Paris seems to have hesitated slightly before accepting Tobler's explanation, especially concerning the pronunciation of the form of the first person singular, *oie*. This, instead of being written *o gié*, implying stress on the final syllable, had its accent on the *ó* and must have been so pronounced by the time it is found in the texts, for we find it rhyming with *joie*.[3] This pronunciation, to quote G. Paris, "semble un peu dur." Paris, however, had at first greeted Tobler's theory with the verdict, "se non è vero, è ben trovato" (*Romania* 6: 156), and later not only adopted it as fully authoritative, but also enlarged upon the parallel negative forms (*Romania* 7: 465).

[1] *Die Negation im Altfranzösischen, Zeits. f. rom. Phil.*, ii (1878), p. 3.

[2] See below, p. 39.

[3] See below, p. 46.

We see therefore to what an extent Tobler's theory attracted attention; it was convincing enough to leave little room for contradiction. Jules Cornu, in his turn, (*Romania* 9: 117) added confirmation from the linguistic point of view:

> Je suis étonné que MM. Tobler et G. Paris aient oublié un argument de première force contre l'étymologie reçue auparavant; ILLUD ne saurait donner que *el*, cf. ILLA > *elle* et ILLOS > *els*, *eux*. Nous en avons la preuve dans *puet cel estre*, où *cel* est certainement le neutre de *cil*.

Gaston Paris pushed the study further in his excellent article on the neuter pronoun in Old French (*Romania* 23: 161), disclosing and utilizing examples of the affirmative locution involving the neuter pronoun *el*, which Tobler had overlooked.

The extracts quoted above are of first importance in the study of the particles of affirmation and negation in French; they may be summed up as follows:

It had always been taken for granted that the Old French affirmative adverb was *oïl*, which as an invariable form was used in answer to all questions calling for an affirmative reply. *Oïl* was thought to mean, in a modern French equivalent, *c'est cela*, or as we often say in English, *that it is* or *that's it*. Tobler shows however that the vocables of affirmation and negation took varying forms in answer to questions differing from each other with respect to the *person* of the verb employed. He finds, for example, that the question 'are you coming' was answered by a locution involving the pronoun of the first person, i.e., *o je*, 'that I am;' 'is he coming' was answered by the form *o il*, etc. Concerning Tobler's paradigm we may add that the form *o elle* which he postulates must remain hypothetical, since no single example of its use has thus far been found to occur; on the other hand he omits the neuter form *o el*, which Gaston Paris later added to the paradigm.

It is true that some of these varieties of the affirma-

tive had been known before Tobler drew attention to them, but previous commentators had not perceived their significance and so the real etymological meaning of *oïl* had failed of recognition. Grimm, for instance, in his *Deutsche Grammatik* 3: 768, cites an example of *aol* (a variant form of *oel*) meaning 'oui' (*Meon* 4, 376) and the negative *naie* (*Renard* 999, 1069). He tries to derive the French affirmative *o* from the M.H.G. *ja*, and the Provençal *oc* from *ja îh* and does not even suggest the derivation *o* <HOC. He is led to this conclusion by the similarity in the grammatical construction of the Old French *o il* and the M.H.G. *ja er*. At a later period, Diez, who, as Tobler points out,[1] knew of this erroneous view, makes no mention of it whatever and takes for granted the derivation of *oc* from HOC. Among the predecessors of Tobler who commented upon the affirmative particle, we should mention, in addition to Grimm and Diez, G. F. Burguy, who in his *Grammaire de la langue d'oïl aux XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles* compiled many valuable and interesting examples which will be of special interest when we come to study the affirmative paradigm in detail. None of these however was aware of the all-important fact that the locution *o il*, later the particle *oui*, had not always been the general affirmative expression in Old French but gradually had become such in proportion as the other forms slowly disappeared. Tobler is quite correct therefore in claiming to be the first one to draw attention to this fact.[2]

To understand the reason why the third person form *oïl* was more commonly used than the others calls for a knowledge of the etymological development of the pronoun *il*, and of how it came to be a neuter pronoun in addition to its rôle as a masculine singular

[1] *Verm. Beiträge z. franz. Gram.*, p. 2.

[2] This he does (*Verm. Beit.*, p. 2) in answer to someone who claimed for Grimm the distinction of establishing the original meaning of *oïl*.

and plural. We are concerned with this pronoun only in so far as it is involved in the affirmative particle, and therefore shall confine ourselves to a short *résumé* of what has been said of it in this regard.

Horning, in his discussion of the neuter pronoun *il*, says:[1]

> Nous acceptons l'explication de Tobler, sauf une réserve toutefois: nous admettons que dans *oïl*, *il* ait été pronom masculin, singulier ou pluriel, mais non pas que cet *il* ait pu être également pronom neutre, du moins à l'époque la plus ancienne. . . . Plus tard, de même que *oïl* s'est dit pour *o je*, *o tu*, etc., il s'est dit aussi pour *o ce*. . . . Il faut modifier alors de la manière suivante l'explication de Tobler: *oïl* qui primitivement signifie *oui il* (pron. masc. sing. et pluriel), se met plus tard dans des propositions affirmatives dont le sujet est proprement *je*, *tu*, *nos*, *vos*, *ço*.

Accepting as correct Horning's proposition that the pronoun *il* was not originally neuter,[2] it is nevertheless hard to accept his theory as to the probable earliest form of the affirmative particle involving a neuter pronoun. It is extremely unlikely that the expression *o ço* was ever current in Old French; certainly, there is nothing in Old French literature that would indicate that it was, and it is upon concrete examples that Horning bases his argument in regard to the neuter pronoun *il*. It is strange that he never even mentions the existence of the neuter pronoun *el*. This pronoun has been found to have been fairly common,[3] but more important still are the actual examples of the affirmative particle *oel* and its variant forms which are to be found in Old French literature. Thus in answer to the question *puet ce estre?* (can *this* be so?) the reply would be *oel* (this *it* can), rather than *o ço*

[1] *Romanische Studien*, 4: 270.

[2] It was, however, as Horning says, very early used as subject of impersonal verbs and became the regular neuter form. This would make Tobler perfectly right in saying that *oïl* could be used in answer to a proposition requiring the neuter pronoun.

[3] Cf. G. Paris, *Romania* 23: 164.

(this *this* can).[1] Horning's modification of Tobler's statement, therefore, seems to be inexact. The fact remains that *oïl* was used logically in answer to such impersonal expressions as *y a il? est il droitz?* etc. The material at hand indicates that *oïl* was used with neuter feeling far more universally than the etymologically more correct form *oel*. This fact is of importance in explaining how it happened that *oïl* was the form to survive as the general affirmative particle in French.[2]

In proceeding to review the various explanations given concerning the affirmative, and corresponding

[1] The explanation of *oel* given by Meyer-Lübke (*Historische Franz. Gram.*, p. 191) is as follows: "Im Zentralfranzösischen ist *aol* und *oal* als Bejahungspartikel üblich, zunächst in Antwort auf eine Frage wie *pluet*, regnet es? *oel*, ja."—It is very difficult, however, to determine to what extent *oel* was used in answer to impersonal verbs. In the greater part of France impersonal expressions, when they had a subject at all, took the neuter form *il*, and therefore the answer to these would very early be *oïl*. As it has come down to us, *oel* is at most a very localized form, as Meyer-Lübke and Gaston Paris point out.

[2] It may be worth while in passing to recall the development of *il* from the Latin. In a paragraph quoted above we have seen that Jules Cornu explained the error of the derivation *oïl*<HOC ILLUD on the ground that ILLUD would naturally give *el*. ILLE, also, would not regularly develop into *il*, but, like ILLUD would give *el:* cf. Spanish *él*<ILLE. To explain the form *il*, a Latin nominative singular ILLI was postulated, explained on the analogy of QUI CUIUS CUI (cf. folk-speech ILLI, ILLUIUS, ILLUI), as the probable folk speech form from which it came. The phonetic phenomenon called *umlaut* or *metaphony* (in French *inflexion*) caused by an anticipation of the final *ī* led the initial *ĭ* to be pronounced *ī*. Thus ĭLLī > īLLī > *il*. ILLI (singular) is starred in the *Dictionnaire Général*, and also in Bourciez's *Eléments de linguistique romane*; but that it really was a current form in Folk Latin is proved by its existence in the collections of Vulgar Latin texts made by W. Heraeus and Morf (*Monum. Germ. Hist.*, 1886). Cf. for example, Pirson's edition of the *Merowingische und karolingische Formulare* (Heidelberg, 1913), p. 8, § 13, "*illi* veniens ad presentiam nostram suggessit . . . , etc." (Bourciez does not omit to quote examples of ILLI used as nom. sing.). As to how *il*, corresponding to the Latin masculine pronoun, came to be used as subject of impersonal expressions, see below, p. 75.

negative particles, it may be of interest to point out the contradiction in regard to them appearing in Darmesteter's *Historical French Grammar* (as it was compiled from his notes). This is done merely to show how easy it has been in the past to be confused on this point. On page 308, in a paragraph dealing with the development of the Latin demonstrative pronouns in Old French, we read:

> HIC, or rather its neuter HOC, is preserved in the Old French *o*, which is found in the compound *oui*, formerly *oïl* from o<HOC plus IL(LUD).

Following this paragraph is a reference to page 383, where the author is discussing the affirmative and negative particles in particular:

> It was for a long time thought that *oïl* and *nennil*, which became *oui* and *nenni*, were formed from HOC ILLUD = 'that is it', and from NON ILLUD = 'it is not it.' The explanation is erroneous. In Old French the answer used to an interrogation was either *o* (Lat. HOC) or *non* (of which the atonic form was *nen*), or else these adverbs followed by the subject of the verb (understood).

Later works on the history of French grammar and language are hardly less brief in their treatment of the affirmative particle than the short articles already summarized. Nyrop (1: 20) gives the derivation of *oïl* as HOC ILLE rather than HOC ILLI the more exact form and the expression he translates into Modern French by *oui il*. This rather unaccountable redundancy had previously been indulged in by Gaston Paris himself, and is probably to be explained as a literal translation of Tobler's *ja er*, his erroneous German translation of *oïl = o il*, 'that he.' Nyrop gives a short account of the neuter *oël* (HOC ILLUM) and its various forms (2: 379); but hardly a full page altogether is devoted to the affirmative particle. He has, however, indirectly indicated the importance and significance of this particle in the history of the language, in treating it at the very outset of his *Grammaire Historique*.

Brunot treats the affirmative particle comparatively

fully in his *Grammaire Historique* (p. 559-560). He too, however, translates *oie* into Modern French by *oui je* and *oïl* by *oui il*. Further references by Brunot to the subject can be found in his *Histoire de la langue française* (1: 213), and in *La Pensée et la langue*, 493.

This practically ends the enumeration of works which have treated the subject of the affirmative and negative particles *oui* and *nenni* from an historical standpoint.

As to the emphatic locutions *si* and *si fait*, which still hold an important place in the spoken language, a few words will suffice to sum up what has been done for their history. Meyer-Lübke, so far as I am aware, is the only scholar who has discussed these locutions etymologically. In his *Grammaire des Langues romanes* he goes back to the Latin as a basis for his explanation, but does not develop the subject, limiting himself to one or two postulated examples:

> Pour la réponse affirmative, il va de soi que partout et à toutes les époques l'affirmation énergique surtout peut s'exprimer par la répétition du verbe: "viens-tu? je viens." Mais ordinairement, au lieu de cette répétition, on a d'abord une tournure comme SIC FACIO, HOC FACIO, et peut-être aussi SIC SUM, SIC HABEO, ou bien SIC FACIT, etc., cf. en anc. français, *ne sai don la dolors m'est prise. Ne sai? Si az* (*Cligés*, 665); *n'a point ci Alexis este avecques vous? Si a certes* (*Mir. N.D.* 40, 874).[1]

But Meyer-Lübke goes no further. Obviously, there are interesting gaps to be filled in, and the historical significance of these locutions is to be emphasized. A. Schulze, for example, has taken up the distinction between the expressions *si faz* and *si faz jo* in Old French.[2] As to their origin or later development Schulze is silent.

The following chapters will be devoted to a detailed study of the French particles of affirmation (and their

[1] *Op. cit.*, 3: 584.

[2] *Zeits. f. rom. Phil.* 20: 404-5 (1896).

parallel negative forms) as these are found occurring in the period of Old French literature. First, however, there will be presented a brief study of the Classical Latin affirmative locutions for the purpose of furnishing an historical perspective.

CHAPTER II

Affirmative Locutions in Latin

The peculiar fact that the Latin language had no definite, or as we may say characteristic, affirmative particle led to the development of a considerable number of locutions to express affirmation.[1] A very common method of answering 'yes' was simply the repetition, with affirmative force, of the word stressed in the interrogation: VENIT? VENIT ("Is he coming?" "Yes"). This method is still fairly prevalent in modern speech, but generally with a "vicarious" verb taking the place of the verb used in the question: "*That seems true?*" "*It does.*" In Latin, the form of the answer depended on the placing of the stress in the question:

> "*Videtis* illam insulam?"
> Aiunt, "*videmus.*"
> —*Vita Sancti Brendani.*

"Do you *see* that island?" And they answer "We *see* it."

Were the stress to be placed otherwise, the answer would correspond:

> "Num *vos* hanc insulam videtis?"
> "*Nosmet,*" aiunt.

"Do *you* see this island?" "*We* do."
Or a third alternative:

> "*Illam* ne insulam videtis?"
> "*Illam ipsam,*" aiunt.

[1] I state the case in this way, and not in the reverse order (namely, that the existence of varied forms hindered the development of any particular affirmative expression), for the reason that with the exception of the Greek *ναι*, I have been unable to find any tendency in the ancient languages to provide themselves with anything approaching the affirmative particles of the modern languages.

"Do you see *that* island?" "That very one."

An examination of Latin texts shows how frequently this was the method of expressing affirmation. The following examples illustrate this usage as it occurs in the works of Plautus and of Terence:

"*Men*, mulier, vocas?"
"*Te*."
—*Cistellaria*.

"Woman, are you calling *me?*" "Yes, *you*."

"Nempe *istic est*, qui Alcesimarcho filiam suam despondit in divitias maximas?"
"*Is ipsust*."
—*Cist*.

"Is he the man who gave his daughter to A. with a very large dowry?" "The very man."

"Tu quoque *aderas*, Phormio?"
"*Aderam*."
—*Phormio*, 858.

"Were you there too, Phormio?" "I was."

"*Factum* hoc est, Dave?"
"*Factum*."
—*Andria*, 665.

"Is this a fact, Davus?" "Yes, a fact."

This mode of affirmation will doubtless always be current in any language,[1] but in modern languages which have a regular affirmative particle it is generally used particularly for emphasis: *voulez-vous m'y accompagner? Je le veux bien*. It is only a step, we may suppose, from the repetition of each verb form to the repetition of the same idea through a vicarious verb. This, as we

[1] Examples in Latin can be multiplied at will. Cf. Terence, *Hecyra*:

"Quid ais? an venit Pamphilus?"
"Venit." l. 346.

"Eho tu, an non habet?"
"Habet." l. 100.
"What, has he not (a wife)?" "Yes."

shall see, is exactly what happened; the repetition of the verb itself, however, existed side by side with the vicarious verb. Examples of this mode of affirmation, unfortunately for our purpose, are rare in the Latin texts; they serve, however, to give a suggestion of what was taking place in the spoken language, and are amply borne out by subsequent developments in Old French as well as in Spanish and Italian. The following examples are given in their probable order of development:

"Scin quid volo ego te accurare?"
"Scio, curabo quae voles."
—*Menæchmi.*

"Do you know what I wish you to see to?" "Yes, I know; your wishes will be carried out."

"Si vis bibere bonum vinum?"[1]
"Si (sic) volo."[2]

"If you wish to drink good wine?" "I wish so."

"Dicis tu ita, mulier?"
"Sic dico."[3]

"Do you say so, woman?" "I say so."

"Spondes ita?"
"Sic facio."[3]

"Do you answer so?" "So I do."

---

[1] A second clause is here implied in the question which if supplied would probably be "id tibi dabo." This would account for the introductory SI in the question.

[2] Quoted by Diez 3: 320. It is very important to note that SI written for SIC is known to Classical Latin. See Propertius 2: 25: 40,

At vos, qui officia in multos revocatis amores
Quantum *si* cruciat lumina vestra dolor.

(But you who are recalling my services to many loves, how much does grief torture your eyes *in doing so*).

In this passage SI is indeed written SIC in the editions of both Butler and Baehrens (Leipsig 1880), but both indicate the form SI as the one appearing in *all* the MSS.

[3] Quoted by Diez with reference to the *Formulae Antiquae in usum regni italici* (Venetiis 1781-92).

In the first example we have the regular form of affirmation in Latin, the mere repetition of the verb in the question. In the second and third there is the additional adverbial form SIC (*Do you wish? So* I wish). This is the intermediate step to the use of the vicarious verb which we have in the last example.

We find a similar use of SIC[1] in Plautus and to a

[1] The derivation of SIC has never been satisfactorily explained. Walde (*Lat. Etym. Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1912) gives an explanation that is based mainly on comparisons with the Greek, and which is inclined to wander over tracks that lead nowhere. He says:

Si "wenn," = volsc. *se pis* "si quis" aus **sei*, woneben als fem. loc. sg. mit Anlaut *su-*, oscan *svai*, *suae*, umbrian *sve*, "si." Gr. ει: αι können als **sei: *sai* (freilich auch anderer Auffassungen fahig) im selben Verhältnisse stehen. Die ursprüngliche Bed. ist demonstrativ, zeitlich "dann," modal "so" (noch in *si dis placet*) woraus die indefinit-relativ erst sekundär entwickelt ist; vgl. auch lat. *sic* (si+ce), "so" und von unserem Stamme noch alat. *soc* "sic" (S. Loewe *Prodr.* 350, Lindsay-Nohl 495, C. Gl. L. VII, 275; nicht ganz gesicherte Glosse) *suad "sic."*

Because Greek had the forms ει, αι meaning the same as Latin SI is no reason for supposing that there existed such Latin forms as **sei* **sai* from which to derive the known Latin form, nor for dealing with feminine locative forms when SI itself is nothing else than the locative masculine and neuter of the archaic demonstrative SUM (which can be found along with the forms SAM SOS SAS in Ennius). The locative ending *-i* is in conformity with the other known examples of the locative case (cf. *quinti die* 'on the fifth day,' a later time-use of the locative). The statement that the original meaning is that of time is not quite exact, because the *temporal* is usually later and derived from the *local* in language; "in this place" comes to have the meaning "in this time." The idea is *local* in *si dis placet*,—"in the *case that* it please the gods." The meaning SI = "if" and SIC = "so" are derived from the co-relative use of these two forms, of which SIC is the emphatic form (cf. HIS = "with or for these," HISCE = "with or for these here"). The complete locution would be for example, "*si* voles *sic* veniam," for which the nearest English equivalent is "*In the case* that you wish it, *in that case* will I come." The original local idea is thus clearly defined. Of the two correlatives, however, the second was nearly always omitted, following a very characteristic genius of language; namely *ellipsis*, or one word being used to express two. The use of both in one sentence is rare in Latin but a very good example exists in Horace, *Epist.* I, 7:

marked degree in Terence.[1] These two writers provide the bulk of material available for a study of the affirmative in Latin, as may be anticipated from the nature of their works. Plautus represents the speech of the better class man in the street, Terence the language of the *Scipios* and *Aemilii*.[2] We find, for example, the following uses of the affirmative in Terence:

> "Si molestus pergis esse, iam intro abripiere atque ibi
> usque ad necem operiere loris."
> "Loris liber?"
> "Sic erit."
> —*Adelphoë.*

"A free man whipped?" "So it will be" (=yes).

> "Sicine est sententia?"
> "Sic (sc. est)."
> —*Heaut. Timor.*

> *Sic* ignovisse putato
> me tibi *si* coenas hodie mecum.

"*In this case* you shall consider that I have pardoned you, *in case* you dine to-day with me" (quoted from A. J. Bell, *The Latin Dual and poetic diction*, Oxford Univ. Press 1923, p. 351). Sometimes the form SI is omitted instead of SIC: "*ni venies ego sic mittam* (*ni* for *nisi*)" "should you not come, *in that case* I shall send." This explanation of SIC enables us to discard all extraneous matter such as conjectural forms, and supposed relationships with Oscan, Umbrian and even Greek; nor does it depend on such forms as *soc*, *suad*, taken from Glosses which are characterized as "nicht ganz gesicherte Glosse."

[1] In addition to those quoted above, the following examples will show how SIC is repeatedly used by him in the same sense:

> "Pro eunuchon (sc. est)?"
> "Sic est." —*Eunuchus* 573.
> "Quid ais, Byrria? Daturne illa Pamphilo hodie nuptum?"
> "Sic est." —*Andria* 301.
> "Illa maneat?"
> "Sic." —*Phormio* 813.

In Plautus we find SIC less frequently used as affirmative:

> "Satin tu sanus es?" "Sic sum ut vides."—*Amph.* 604.

[2] Cf. W. S. Teuffel's, *Geschichte der römischen literatur*, Berlin 1916, p. 200.

"Is this your opinion?" "So it is" (=yes).

"Valet atque vivit."
"ubi namst quaeso."
"apud me domi."
"meus gnatus?"
"Sic est."

—*Heaut. Timor.*

"He is alive and well." "Where is he now, pray?" "At my house." "My son (sc. is at your house)?" "So he is."

Phanium relictam solam?
Sic (sc. est).

Terence, *Phormio*, 316.

"Phanium left alone?" "So."

In slightly more than one-third of the cases where Terence makes use of an affirmative answer he employs SIC, which shows that approximately one century before classical Latin had reached the point of perfection to which Cicero and Vergil brought it, the word that is to-day the regular affirmative particle in Spain and Italy and an emphatic affirmative in France was already being frequently used in a like sense. In the first example above, SIC seems to sum up the whole idea followed by an impersonal verb; in the second it merely answers itself,—"Is *such* the opinion? *Such* it is" (we may suppose that the use of SIC for affirmation first came to be used in cases similar to this); in the third example it is a substitution for the phrase APUD ME DOMI; and in the last it is used instead of a repetition of the adjective SOLAM: in place of the answer 'SOLA EST,' we find SIC (EST). It may be pointed out that in the foregoing examples the verb is sometimes omitted, as is very frequently the case after SIC; the verb-sense however is always present here, the verb always being understood and readily supplied. It is not until much later that the verb-sense disappears; i.e., SIC *is not an affirmative particle in Latin, but a vicarious word in an affirmative locution where the repetition of the verb is the*

primary affirmative device. The affirmative particle will evolve from this later. To illustrate, take the example already given above—DICIS TU ITA, MULIER?—the answer to which could be rendered in the affirmative by DICO alone, SIC being merely intensive, and synonymous with ITA.[1]

The demonstrative sense of SIC has already been explained (p. 26, n. 1), so that it is not surprising to find that other Latin expressions used for the affirmative should also be demonstratives. In Plautus, for example, instead of SIC the more common word which helps out the affirmative locution is ITA.

"Patrem fuisse Moschum tibi, ais?"
"*Ita* vero (*sc.* aio)."
—*Menæchmi.*

"Do you say that your father's name was Moschus?" "So indeed (sc. I say)."

The following example, somewhat similar to one quoted in regard to the use of SIC, suggests the origin of ITA as an affirmative:

"Ego te vehementer perire cupio, ne tu nescias."
"*Itane* vero?"
"*Ita* hercle vero."

"I most strongly desire that you may perish, and don't forget it." "So indeed?" "Yes, by heaven, indeed so." ITA also answers the question with HIC (fem. HAEC):[2]

"Haecine tua domust?"
"Ita inquam."

[1] In the *Andria* of Terence (line 804) there is an emphatic affirmative use of SIC that shows that the verb could at times be; very weak:

"Quid vos? Quo pacto hic? Satine recte." "Nosne? SIC."

[2] But in the following, HIC is used affirmatively in answer to HIC:

"Sed hicinest Simo?" "Hic Simost."
—*Andria* 907.

"Is this Simo?" "This is he."

"Haecine est?" "Haec est."
—*Hecyra* 771.

"Is *this* she?" "*This* is (=yes)."

"Is this your house?" "*So*, I say (=yes)."
Here one might reasonably expect the answer HAEC or possibly the neuter form HOC. No instance of HOC used as an affirmative particle has yet been found in Latin texts, a fact that is somewhat surprising considering that HOC became the regular word of affirmation in Provençal, and the basis of the Old French affirmative.

Diez quotes an example of HOC in Plautus (*Baccides* 754-757), but seems to have mistranslated it. He says:

> Provençal *oc* is Latin HOC, which used alone can just as well be a negation; e.g., NUMQUID ALIUD?
> Answer: HOC ("this only, nothing more"). Provençal would be *al ren voletz? No.*

The context shows that this is not correct:

> "Mnesiloche et tu, Pistoclere, iam facite in biclinio
> Cum amica sua uterque accubitum eatis—ita negotiumst—
> Atque ibidem ubi nunc sunt lecti strati potetis cito."
> "*Numquid aliud?*"[1]
> "*Hoc*, atque etiam: ubi erit accubitum semel,
> Ne quoquam exsurgatis, donec a me erit signum datum."

Hoc here undoubtedly refers to what precedes, on account of the addition of ATQUE ETIAM. That it does not mean "no, nothing else" as Diez translates it, is evident from the context as shown by the speaker's subsequent remarks. The idea expressed here is: "Do you wish anything else?" "*This* (what I have told you) and one thing more: when you are once reclined, do not jump up until I give the signal." There is probably a slight idea of affirmative sense here, but the context would have to be strained considerably to see in this example of HOC a Latin equivalent to the Provençal *oc* or Old French *oïl*.

Aside from the demonstratives used in affirmative locutions that have already been enumerated, SIC, ITA,

[1] NUM does not in Plautus necessarily imply "no" in the answer, it has not yet developed its temporal sense, but serves in this instance merely to introduce the question.

HOC, Latin employed others to give emphasis to affirmative ideas:

"Homo hic ebrius est, ut opinor."
"Utinam ita essem."
"Optas quae facta."
"Egone?"
"Tu istic."
—*Amphitruo*, 575.

"This man is drunk I think." "Would that I were so." "You are wishing what is the case." "I?" "Yes, you." This, written out in full would be:

"Optas quae facta."
"Egone ebrius sum?"
"Tu istic es."

"I (am drunk)?" "*You* (are) *that*."
This is perhaps not far removed in feeling from a possible rendering in Old French:

"Jo lo sui?"
"O tu."

but this point need not be over-emphasized, as the development of the affirmative in Old French will be found to work out fairly logically by itself.

Although a number of the adverbs of affirmation used in Latin have not survived in Old French there are at least two (in addition to SIC, already mentioned) which have come down even into Modern French, e.g., CERTO (sometimes CERTE)[1] and VERO (or VERUM):

"Estne tu Syracusanus?"
"*Certo*."
—*Menæchmi* 1109.

"Cur igitur me tibi iussisti coquere dudum prandium?"
"Egon te iussi coquere?"
"*Certo*, tibi et parasito tuo."
—*Menæchmi* 389.

"Then why did you order me to cook luncheon for you

[1] CERTO, 'for sure,' is stronger than CERTE, 'to be sure.'

a while ago?" "I ordered you to cook it?" "Yes, for you and your parasite."

"Liberum ego te iussi abire?"
"*Certo.*"
—*Menæchmi*, 1058.

"So I ordered you to go free?" "For sure (=yes)."

"Expedies?"
"*Certe*, Pamphile."
—Terence, *Andria*, 617.

"Do you set me free?" "Certainly."

The use of VERO was originally a means of accentuating the affirmation, but could be used alone as the equivalent of an affirmative particle, meaning 'yes, certainly, indeed.' It was also used in corroborative replies.

As an intensive word:

"Quid! negas?"
"Nego, hercle, *vero*."
—Plautus, *Curculio*, 711.[1]

"What! do you deny it?" "I do deny it, indeed."

"Quid, domum vostram?"
"Ita enim *vero*."
—*Amph.*, 410.

"What, to your house?" "So indeed."

As a means of affirmation in itself, it generally takes the form VERUM, which appears more frequently than the form VERO in Plautus and Terence. (By the classical period VERUM was an archaic form as far as the literary language was concerned. VERO seems to have been the only classical form in general use).

"Ergo edepol, si recte facias, ere, med emittas manu."
"Liberem ego te?"
"*Verum*, quandoquidem, ere, te servavi."
—*Menæchmi*, 1025.

[1] The same question and answer appear also in *Menæchmi* 631, 821.

"Therefore, master, if you do rightly, you will free me." "I free you?" "Indeed, seeing that, master, I have saved your life."

"Men quaerit?"
"*Verum.*"
—Terence, *Adel.*, 543.

"Are you seeking me?" "Indeed (=yes)."

In corroborative replies:

"Fuisti saepe, credo, in scholis philosophorum."
"*Vero*, ac libenter quidem."

"You have often been, I believe, in schools of philosophers." "Indeed so, and had a very good time."

Latin also employed various other words to express affirmation. They may be briefly summarized here.

ETIAM, which originally meant 'even now' (IAM being an old accusative indicating limit of time), comes to be used quite commonly as an affirmative. In the question and answer VENIS? ETIAM("are you coming?" "even now"), the time expression is virtually an affirmative, and it is doubtless from such contexts that ETIAM came to be used generally in this sense. In the *Vulgate* and Ecclesiastical Latin all through the Middle Ages we find ETIAM quite frequently meaning 'yes.' In *Matthew* xviii. 25, for example, we read:

"Magister vester non solvit didrachma?"
Ait: "*etiam.*"

"Doth not your master pay the tribute?" He saith: "yes."

As early as Terence, however, ETIAM already has a very strong affirmative meaning:

"Nil dicam aliud?"
"*Etiam.*"
—*Hecyra*, 811.

"Shall I say nothing else?" "Yes."

VALDE (or, as it is earlier found, VALIDE, the adverbial form of VALIDUS) is also used as a strong affirmative:

"Meam tu amicam vendidisti?"
"*Valide*, viginti minis."
—*Pseudolus*, 344.

"Did you sell my friend?" "Yes, for twenty shekels."

SANE, a more colloquial affirmative, means literally "healthily" (cf. the English expression "mightily").

"Nempe ergo aperte vis quae restant me loqui?"
"*Sane quidem.*"
—*Andria*, 195..

"As for the rest, do you want me to make myself clearer?" "Yes, I certainly do."

Certain affirmative locutions admit of abbreviation, just as SIC EST, ITA EST are abbreviated to SIC and ITA alone. This also takes place in the expression FACTUM EST, "it is a fact," as we see in the following examples (the verb being expressed in the first and omitted in the second):

"Dic mihi: an dolor repente invasit?"
"*Ita factumst.*"
—*Hecyra*, 357.

"Tell me, has she had a new access of pain?" "Yes" (lit. "such is the fact").

"Dixtin dudum illam, dixisse se exspectare filium?"
"*Factum.*"[1]
—*Hecyra*, 451..

"Didn't you say that she was awaiting your son?" "Yes," (lit. "it is a fact," the verb being understood).

We should also include another expression not generally found in lists of Latin affirmatives:[2] namely AIO, "I say yes" as distinct from NEGO "I say no." Cf. Horace, *Satyres*, ii: 1: 5-6:

[1] See a similar use of FACTUM meaning 'yes' in *Hecyra*, line 846.

[2] Kühner, for example, omits it, as he also does SIC (*Ausführliche lat. Gram.* ii: 2: 531).

Trebati
quid faciam praescribe. "Quiescas." Ne faciam, inquis, omnino versus? "*Aio.*"[1]

"Trebatus, pray tell me what am I to do?" "Be silent." "And am I to write no more poetry?" "I say so."

In concluding this *résumé* of the methods of affirmation in Latin, the use of personal pronouns (nominative case) in affirmative replies should be mentioned, in view of the important part which they were to play in the formation of the affirmative particle in French, and in many special forms of the affirmative in Italian and Spanish.[2] For example, note the following question and answer:

"Hocine agis an non?"
"*Ego* vero istuc."
—Terence, *Andria*, 186.

"Are you doing this or not?" "I (am doing) in truth this which you speak of."

This latin affirmative admits of a fairly literal translation into Old French, though the writer does not wish to exaggerate this point:

"Le fais tu o non?"
"*O je* voir."

"Do you do it or not?" "*That I* indeed (sc. do)."

There is no doubt, however, that the use of the pronoun in Old French accentuates the affirmative idea in a way similar to that which we find in the Latin. The idea of the pronoun is uppermost in both: "do *you* do it? That *I* do:" "HOCINE AGIS? EGO VERO." In the spoken Latin we have every reason to suppose that

[1] A strange use of AIO where the idiom would seem to demand NEGO, unless stated in full: *Aio, ne facias.*

[2] Cf. Italian: *io si*, "yes" (yes *I*, nobody else); Spanish: "Estais mejor?" "*Yo si*;" and Old French: "Comment le sez?" "Je l'ai veu." "Tristran?" "*Je*, voire." (*Tristran et Iseult*, Béroul, 4296).

the pronoun will continue to be used to accentuate both affirmative and negative replies, because we shall see later that the pronominal feeling exists long after the verb feeling has disappeared. The consciousness that the verb is understood is never absent in the Latin reply, however, as Latin never really developed an affirmative particle, but used affirmative locutions where sometimes the verb, sometimes the subject, was not expressed. The following example shows the use of the pronoun as accentuating an affirmation in which the verb is expressed:

> "Estne hic quem video Crito sobrinus Chrysidis?"
> "*Is* est."
> —*Andria*, 800-2.

"Is this man whom I see the cousin of Critus?" "*He* is the man (yes, he is)."

The pronoun will naturally be used when answering logically a question of which the corresponding pronoun is the subject:

> ". . . quae perturbes haec tua impudentia."
> "*Egon?*"
> "*Tu*, inquam, mulier."
> —*Hecyra*, 214.

"And now you disturb everything with your impudence." "I?" "Yes, *you* woman."

> "Tun med indutum fuisse pallam praedicas?"
> "*Ego*, hercle, vero (sc. praedico)."
> —*Menœchmi*, 516.

"You declare I had put on the mantle?" "*I* indeed (sc. say so) = yes, indeed I do."

The use of the pronoun can be carried over into corroborative replies:

> "Ob istuc unum verbum dignus, deciens, qui furcam feras."
> "*Egomet* laetor."
> —Plautus, *Cistell.*, 248.

"For this one word you deserve to bear the yoke ten times over." "*I* gladly (=by all means, certainly)."

This completes the enumeration of the outstanding illustrations of the affirmative in Latin, and shows how the absence of any definite particle led to the use of a wide range of forms and locutions. Only those forms which appear later in Old French have been dealt with at any length. These, however, with the exception of SIC, are comparatively unimportant in Old French, because of the development of an affirmative locution peculiar to the province of Gaul, direct traces of which we have been unable to find in Latin texts.

CHAPTER III

The Affirmative in Old French

We have seen that the Old French affirmative *oïl* (Mod. Fr. *oui*) was only one of several related forms employed to express affirmation in Old French. These forms, arranged methodically, make up what we have called a paradigm corresponding to the list of the nominative personal pronouns, e.g., *oje, oïl, oel,* etc. This is illustrated in the formulary quoted from Darmesteter: "*as tu bien fait?—oje; a-t-il bien fait?—oïl,*" etc. In this paradigm the answers are precisely what one would expect from the nature of the affirmative particle as it existed in Old French. Such answers therefore may be called *logical* answers: i.e., there is no confusion as to the meaning of each form, the answer indicating clearly whether it has reference to the first, second or third person.[1]

The examples of the affirmative particles which we find existing in Old French texts indicate, however, that although the various forms must have been used "logically" at the outset, confusion as to their etymological meaning had early become prevalent in the language. This confusion consisted in substituting the form of the *third* person (masc. and neuter) for that of the first person or of the second person. *Oïl* (and in certain parts of France, *oel*), the form of the third person, is, at the time of the earliest French manu-

[1] Cf. Foerster (*Zeitsch. f. r. Phil.*, 2: 171): "Theoretisch soll die Antwort auf eine Frage das regierende Verbum wiederholen, z. B. '*me connissies vos? fait Aucassins*' soll eigentlich beantwortet werden *je conois vos*; diese schleppende Art wird verkürzt durch die Setzung einer Partikel, wobei dann das Verb fehlen kann; mithin *oje.*"

scripts, already a generalized form of the affirmative particle, and accordingly is used *illogically* wherever we find it employed in a context which calls for the use of either of the other two persons. For example:

> "Et vos, sire arcevesques, *gaberez vos* od nos?"
> "*Oïl*," ço dist Turpins, "per le comant Charlon."
> —*Pèlerinage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem*, 493-4.

In answer to the question addressed to the archbishop, "will *you* boast with us?" we should, according to the affirmative paradigm, expect the answer, "*that I* (will)," Old French "*oje*." On the other hand, occurrences of the forms *oje*, *o nos*, *o vos* are always *survivals* of the primitive formula, and never represent a confusion of terms. Wherever we find an example of *oje*, *o nos*, *o vos* (or the negative forms *naie*, *ne tu*) the form employed is the one logically required.[1] In other words, the forms of the third person gradually encroached upon and crowded out those of the first and second person. Our examination of the affirmative paradigm, therefore, may well begin with a study of the forms *oje*, *o nos*, etc., which retained their original meaning as long as they survived, and for this reason best illustrate the historical development of the French "*oui*."

1. Oie, o nos

Judging from the number of examples of *oie* to be found in Old French texts, this particle must have remained in use longer than any other form in the affirmative paradigm with the exception of *oïl*. The writer has discovered upwards of twenty of these examples using only the available printed editions of

[1] It may be well to quote Foerster again in regard to this point, as he is the first to state it definitely: "Dass die Auffassung des *oje* richtig ist, erhellt daraus, dass ausnahmlos die vorausgehende Frage grammatisch an die angeredete 2te Person gerichtet ist, wenn *oje* steht; also z.B. wird man nie nach: weiss *er* es? ein *oje* finden, weil ein *ich* hier sinnlos wäre; dann steht *oïl*" (*op. cit.*, p. 171).

the texts, many of which omit the variant readings. To these may be added more than twice that number of parallel examples of the negative particle involving *je*. This number, while not in itself large, is sufficiently so to throw interesting light on the history of the French affirmative. It indicates that there was still a consciousness of the original distinction between *oie* and the other forms of the paradigm even at a time when the third person form *oïl* had come to be the general affirmative particle of the language. A computation of the exact number of times in which *oie* occurs in print would require an examination of texts where all the variant readings are given.

The following passages illustrate the use of *oie*:

"Namles," dist Carles, "es tu sains et entier?"
"*Oie*, voir, sire, ainc n'i oi encombrier."
—*Aspremont*, 2769-70.[1]

"Namles, *are you* safe and sound?" "*That I* (am), sire, truly."

"Dites, biaus frere, feres me vous aïe?"
"*Oie* voir, sire, je ne vous faurai mie."
—*Aliscans*, 2127-8.[2]

"Tell me, brother, will you give me aid?" "*That I* (will) indeed, sire, I shall not fail you."

"Aves vous relenqui Mahomet, bele fille?"
"*Oie*," che dist la dame.
—*Aiol et Mirabel*, 9673-4.[3]

"Have you renounced Mahomet?" "*That I* (have)," said the lady.

[1] *Classiques franç. du moyen âge* (Champion 1919), edited by Louis Brandin from the MS. of Wollaton Hall (*W*).

[2] Edition by Wienbeck, Hartnacke & Rasch (Halle 1903); see line 2250 and variant indicated of MS. *C*. The older Guessard edition (*Les anciens poètes de la France*, Paris 1870) reads *oïl*.

[3] *Anc. textes franç.* This is the reading from the sole existing manuscript and is taken from the second part of the poem, written in the dialect of Picardy (see editor's introduction, page ix). A second example of *oie* occurs almost immediately after, in line 9680.

The literal meaning of *oie* in the foregoing examples is clear enough. Its primitive signification was undoubtedly present to the consciousness of those who used the particle, as is abundantly proved by the fact that the form *oie* never occurs except where it is logically applicable. On the other hand, the limited number of such examples would indicate that its use had become greatly restricted as early as the 13th century.[1] There is a possibility of adding to the number of occurrences here cited. An examination of variant readings will show that there often exists a reading *oie* beside the form *oïl*, and that the editors have in many cases inserted the latter form. In Wallensköld's edition of the *Chansons de Conon de Bethune*[2] for instance, the editor gives *oïl* as the reading (iii, 17):

> "Le irai-je dont s'amor demander?
> *Oïl*, par Dieu! car tel sont li usaige."

"Shall I go then and ask for her love? *Yes*,[3] by heaven! for such is the custom." *Oïl* is the reading also of the manuscripts noted as *M*, f. 45 (Quenes) and *T*, f. 99 (Mesire Quenes); but in *e*, f. 2 the reading is *oie*, which would furnish a logical answer: "Shall I go? *That I* (shall)."

In *Auberee*, lines 614-616, there occurs a similar instance; the printed text reads as follows:[4]

> "Or me dites, dame Auberee,
> Fustes vous piec'a en meson?"
> "*Oïl* sire."

The question "Were you recently" is here answered illogically if we insist on a literal rendering—which is not an unreasonable demand, since manuscript *D* in this passage reads "*oie* sire."

[1] The MS. of *Aiol* for example belongs to that century.

[2] *Classiques français du moyen âge* (Champion 1921).

[3] No other translation is possible once the original meaning is no longer felt.

[4] *Auberee, altfranzösisches fabel*, mit einleitung und anmerkungen hrsg. von Georg Ebeling (Halle a.S. 1895).

Foerster's edition of *Cligés* furnishes several such instances: cf. lines 4450-54:

> "Assez i poi sanblanz veoir
> D'amor, se je neant an sai.
> *Oïl*, tant que mar le pansai,
> Mar l'ai apris et retenu
> Car trop m'an est mesavenu."

The logical form here required is *oie*: "I could see sufficient semblance of love here, if aught I know of it. *That I* (could)," etc. This is precisely what we read in the variant furnished by Foerster from manuscript *P* (p. 181, *op. cit.*).[1]

What, exactly, do these variant readings lead us to conclude? The foregoing quotations show that the editors have in each case adopted the form *oïl* (etymologically the incorrect one) when at least one manuscript in each case has provided them with the logical form. Such differences in the readings of the manuscripts show that there has been a substitution made by copyists of one of these particles for the other. This substitution, according to our examples, has evidently been that of *oïl* for *oie*, since the latter is the only logical form and since there is no single known example of *oie* used by confusion where *oïl* is required. Is it not, therefore, reasonable to suppose that in each case where a manuscript, be it only one of several, gives the logical form of the affirmative particle, this reading should be taken as the one reproducing the original manuscript? It is not likely that a scribe or copyist of later date would replace by the logical *oie* an author's

[1] That Chrétien de Troyes frequently used the form *oie* where the sense required it, is attested by its repeated occurrence in the list of variants of Foerster's edition of his works. See, for example, lines 930-1:

> Si n'en ferai ma volanté?
> *Oïl*, meis que ne li despleise.

MS. *C* gives the reading *oie*.

original *oïl*.[1] Therefore, the existence of *oie* in any one of the manuscripts would seem to be sufficient authority for accepting it as the true reading.

M. Ernest Langlois, in his edition of *Le Jeu de la Feuillée*,[2] has gone further than this. He restores conjecturally (or better, logically) the form *oie* even when the manuscript[3] reads *oïl*. For the first time, therefore, a printed text of this work reads *oie* where the sense demands it. Take, for instance, lines 928-931:

Gillos: Hane, demandés Ravelet
S'il a chaiens nul rehaignet
K'il ait d'ersoir repas en mue.
Li Ostes: *Oie*, un herenc de Gernemue,
Sans plus, Gillot, je vous oc bien.

"Ask Ravelet if he has within any remains of last night's meal?" And the tavernkeeper (Ravelet) hearing this, breaks in with a "*That I* (have), a Gernemue herring." Coussemaker's old edition of *Le Jeu de la Feuillée*[4] and the manuscript both give *oïl* in l. 931:

Oïl, un harenc de Gernemue.

Oïl, however, makes one syllable too many in the line, which should be octosyllabic. M. Langlois thinks, with very good reason, that Adam le Bossu wrote *oie*, not only because the sense requires it, but because the measure is spoiled by reading *oïl*. The same for line 904, where the manuscript gives *oue* (doubtless a copyist's mistake in writing *oie*); Coussemaker's rendering is *oue*, evidently as an affirmative particle, as we see from the context:

[1] The tendency, indeed, as the whole history of the affirmative particle proves, was entirely in the other direction: *oïl* finally crowds out all the other forms of the paradigm.

[2] *Classiques français du moyen âge* (Champion, 1911).

[3] Langlois gives the following particulars: "*Le Jeu de la Feuillée* est conservé dans un seul manuscrit (Bibl. Nat. fr. 25566 = *P*) sous la rubrique *Li jus Adam*, et avec l'explicit *Li jeus de la feullie*. Cette copie est de la fin du XIII[e] siècle; le dialecte en est picard." We have already seen that the two examples of *oie* in *Aiol* were in the second part of the poem, which is in the dialect of Picardy.

[4] *Œuvres complètes du trouvère Adam de la Halle*, Paris 1872.

Hane: Rikeche, veistes vous l'oste?
Rikiers: *Oue* il est chaiens.

As Langlois says, in giving reasons for the reading *oie* in this passage, *oue* cannot be a mis-spelt *oïl*, for that would again spoil the rhythm; he has also restored an *oie* in line 231, concerning which he says:

Le manuscrit donne *oïl*, de même aux vers 233, 931, 996, et *oue* au v. 904; *oïl* fausse la mesure du v. 931, il la fausserait de même au v. 904; la leçon *oie* s'impose donc dans ces deux cas. J'ai étendu la même correction aux v. 231, 233, 996, où la mesure ne l'exigeait pas, mais où le sens et les habitudes des poètes artésiens le demandaient.[1]

This procedure seems to be warranted for the further reason that Adam le Bossu sometimes used the corresponding negative form *naie*, as appears in line 191:

. . . estes vous ivres?
Naie, je ne bui hui de vin.

For this reason we may reasonably suppose that he knew and used the affirmative *oie*.

In the light of M. Langlois's remark above quoted it is interesting to compare, in regard to the affirmative particle, two passages in his edition of the *Coronemenz Looïs* (*Anciens textes français*, 1888) with the same passages as they appear in an edition which he has recently published in the *Classiques français du moyen âge*, 1920. In the former, lines 561-2 read:

"Gentilz om, sire, avez tant espleitié?"
"*Oïl*, bels sire, a celer ne vos quier."

and lines 1157-8:

"Oncles," fait il, "estes sains et haitiez?"
"*Oïl*," fait il, "La merci Deu del ciel."

In the later edition the corresponding replies read:

Oie, bels sire, a celer ne vos quier,

and,

Oie, fait il, la merci Deu del ciel.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 56.

Without being able to consult the manuscripts directly, it is impossible to quote the written authority for such a correction, for in the edition of 1888 the variants give no indication of the form *oie*; the manuscripts, in the *A* and *B* groups at least, give *oïl*.[1] It is evident, however, that Langlois found written authority in these two cases, for he has not made a general substitution of *oie* for *oïl* where the sense alone required it.[2] The step thus taken by him in restoring as many as possible of the original forms of the affirmative particle is an important one, and, if followed in future editions of Old French texts, may result in adding considerably to the number of the less usual forms already brought to light.

We now come to a second point regarding the particle *oie*, namely, its pronunciation and phonological development. It has been shown that Tobler in his first article on the derivation of *oïl*[3] had been obliged to regard the stress as coming on the *ó* (of *oie*) by virtue of its rhyming with *joie* (*Barb. et Méon*, iii, 396, 104) and with *veoie* (*Eraclius*, 534). A similar case appears in the fabliau of *Estula* (103-4):

Se li demanda par grant joie:
"Aportes tu riens?" "Par foi, *oie*."

"Do you bring anything?" "*That I* (do), by my faith."

Judging from this example, *oie* counted as only one syllable when it ended the line. Gaston Paris was inclined to look upon the pronunciation *o gié* as more natural, viewed in the light of the third person form *oïl*.

[1] *Classiques français*, pp. 95 and 105.

[2] Cf. for example, lines 2625-6 (edition of 1920) with lines 1157-8 quoted above:

"Oncles Guillelmes, estes sains et haitiez?"
"*Oïl*," dist il, "la merci Deu del ciel."

The MS. which supplied the authority for the reading *oie* in lines 562 and 1158 has evidently failed to do so here.

[3] *Zeit. f. Vergl. Sprachf.*, p. 423, n. 1.

It need not follow, however, that because the pronoun is pronounced (jə) and not (ʒə) it loses thereby any of its individual significance. Tobler has already quoted the rhyme *di ge: mie* in support of his spelling *oje*.[1] This pronunciation of the pronoun *je* has been very reasonably explained by Meyer-Lübke.[2]

> If *-ie* is supported by a word ending in a vowel, the *i* remains vocalic (*j*), rhyming like *o ie* with *ve oie* (*Heraclius* 537), *pri ie* with *-ie* (*Jaques d'Amiens* 2, 63); whereas if following a consonant, the *i* is treated like an initial sound and becomes *je* (ʒə), rhyming *avenir je* with *virge*. These rhymes clearly show the contrast.

He states definitely that *oie* bore the stress on the *ó*, thus accepting as general the pronunciation it must have had in the rhyme.

Some measure of support for placing the stress on the personal pronoun, as Gaston Paris advocated, is found in a few examples of the Provençal affirmative, involving the pronoun of the first person:

> "Si.t puesc de ton caval abatre
> laisar m'as pueis dormir?" "*O ieu*,"
> So ditz lo senescals, "per dieu."[3]

The personal pronoun in this example is clearly in tonic position (cf. the Modern French *moi*), as the rhyme with *dieu* indicates. The same is true in the following example as evidenced by the similarity in form:

> "Oimais," dis el, "sol que no us pes,
> me laisaretz dormir, so cre."
> Dis lo senescals: "per ma fe,
> *O ieu*, car assatz n'ai razon."[3]

Two explanations may be suggested for such an affirmative form in Provençal. It may be the survival of a very

[1] Cf. Langlois (*Le Jeu de la Feuillée, Classiques français*, p. 56) "La rime *oie*: *joie* dans le fableau d' *Estula* prouve qu'il faut écrire *oie* et non *oje*." This would be true if only to mark the difference between the regular pronunciation of *je* and its pronunciation in the affirmative particle.

[2] *Historische französische Grammatik*, pp. 189-190.

[3] *Jaufre* (Constans: *Provenzalische Chrestomathie*, p. 17).

old form of affirmation, or on the other hand it may be due to the influence of the old French writers.[1]

Finally the fact that *oie* appears in the rhyme proves the existence of such a form. The cases we have examined show how the copyists were gradually substituting the generalized form *oïl* in its stead. Sometimes there is only one extant manuscript giving the correct reading. Those instances of *oie* in the rhyme, therefore, would have remained to us even if this process of substitution had been complete in every other case. The very fact that a substitution of *oïl* for *oie* did not alter the meaning of the passage in any way must have led to a great number of instances where the primitive reading has absolutely disappeared from all the known manuscripts of certain works. There was no check as to *sense* on the scribe, and thus the current form could replace the archaic form without difficulty. This being the case, it can readily be imagined that the original significance of the pronoun or, in other words, the etymological sense in the affirmative particle was a great deal stronger in the early transitional period of the language than one might judge from the examples that have come down to us. In those examples of *oie* occurring in the rhyme, there could of course be no substitution of *oïl* without violating the rhyme, and here the scribe was forced to reproduce the reading of the original manuscript.

It has been seen that the manuscripts from the northern part of the Ile de France and from Picardy[2]

[1] The writer is rather inclined to accept the first of these alternatives as being the more likely. The reason will be seen in Conclusion (see p. 100, n. 1). Regarding the two examples in question, it may be said that they occur in a text that does not show influence of Old French linguistic forms.

[2] See above p. 44, n. 3; MS. *P* of *Cligés* which alone provided the logical form, as noted above, is also, on the authority of Foerster, the work of a scribe from Picardy (see Foerster's edition, Introduction, p. xxix). The fact, too, that Adam le Bossu wrote in the Picard dialect, is an argument which M. Langlois uses in restoring

furnish the most fruitful source of examples of *oie*. It may be of interest, therefore, to give in detail the list of affirmative particles found in *Aucassin et Nicolette*, of which there is but a single manuscript extant. This manuscript is in the dialect of Picardy, dating from the end of the twelfth century, and the affirmatives are with but two exceptions logical, showing how clear was the feeling as to the value of the personal pronoun at that time. In order to show the contrast between the form of the first and that of the third person, these are quoted side by side as they appear in the text:[1]

x, 57-8. "Est ce tote la fins?" fait Aucassins.
"Si m'aït dix," fait li peres, "*oïl*."[2]

"Is this all you have to say?" "So help me God," says the father, "*that it* (is)."

x, 73-5. "Comment?" fait Auc. "Ene conissies vos que je vos ai pris?"
"Sire, *oie*," fait li quens Borgars.

"What, do you not know that I am the one who captured you?" "Sire, *that I* (do)."

xxiv, 33-4. "Ba! me conissies vos?" fait Auc.
"*Oie*, je sai bien que vos estes Auc. li fix le conte."

"Do you know who I am?" "*That I* (do), I know well that you are Aucassin the son of the count."

xxviii, 12-14. Puis demanda, quex hon c'estoit, ne s'il avoit guerre, et on li dist: "*oïl*,[3] grande."

---

oie where the context requires it in *Le jeu de la Feuillée*. Furthermore, we have seen that one of the MSS. gives authority for the reading *oie* in Conon de Béthune (Chanson iii, 17) concerning whose language we read (*Class. fr. du moyen âge*, Intro. p. xvi): "Conon de Béthune ayant dit lui-même que sa *parole* n'était pas *franchoise* (iii, 10) et qu'il avait *dit mos d'Artois*, parce qu'il n'avait pas été *norris a Pantoise* (iii, 13-14), il y a lieu de rechercher les traits artésiens (picards) qui peuvent se rencontrer dans les rimes et la mesure des chansons qui lui sont attribuées."

[1] The citation of paragraphs and lines is from Suchier (3rd edition, 1889).

[2] *Il* here may be taken as neuter, see below, p. 77.

[3] Neuter *il* in logical answer to the neuter *il* in the impersonal phrase *il avoit guerre*.

Then he asked what manner of man he was, and if there was a war in progress, and they said to him, "*That there* (is), and a great one, too."

xxxii, 3-6. "Sire," fait Auc. "sont ce ci vostre anemi?"
"*Oïl*, sire," fait li rois.
"Et vouriies vos que je vos en venjasse?"
"*Oie*," fait il, "volentiers."[1]

"Sire, are these your enemies?" "*That they* (are), sire," says the king. "And do you wish me to avenge you of them?" "*That I* (do)," says he, "and very willingly."

xl, 3-5. "Biax dous amis," fait Auc., "saves vos nient de cele Nicolete dont vos aves ci canté?"
"Sire, *oie*."

"Fair gentle friend," says Auc., "know you anything of this Nicolette of whom you have just sung?" "Sire, *that I* (do)."

As indicated above there remain two examples of *oïl* used illogically in this story:

xviii, 15-17. "Bel enfant," fait ele, "conissies vos Aucassin le fil le conte Garin de Biaucaire?"
"*Oïl*, bien le counisçons nos."

and again:

xxii, 10-11. "Bel enfant," fait Aucassins, "Enne me conissies vos?"
"*Oïl*, nos savions bien que vos estes Aucassins."

Here the question is addressed to a number of persons: "do you (boys) know me," to which reply is made in the generalized form of the affirmative *oïl* instead of the logical *o nos* (that *we* do).[2]

[1] The proximity of these two forms *oïl* and *oie* in particular shows clearly the strong sense of their literal meaning existing in the mind of the writer.

[2] Before leaving the subject of *oie* it is interesting to note a curious confusion of the pronoun-sense found in *Le mystère d'Adam:* (l. 178.)

Diabolus: As tu donch altre deduit?
Adam: *Jo, oïl* ne me falt.

This brings us to a discussion of the affirmative involving the plural pronoun *nos*. Such a discussion will necessarily be brief, owing to the scarcity of the form *o nos*. Tobler postulated it without giving examples, but Foerster has cited two very good ones in his discussion of the Old French affirmative already referred to:[1]

> *O nos* is the affirmative when the question has a *you* as the subject: 'Comment, dant Renart . . . refuses vos Le corone?'—'Lupart! *o nos*, s'ensi est, etc.;' (*Cour. Renart*, 2560): Similarly (*Fl Florette* 7898): . . . . 'Dites-moi, connoissiez le vos?' is answered, (Rois Juliens respont): '*O nos*, sachies que c'est le biau salvage.'

Diez had already signalized a similar construction in Old Provençal:[2]

> Voletz vos combatre? *Oc nos.*

This example is taken from the old edition of the Provençal version of *Fierabras*, published by Bekker in 1829.

These three passages are extremely important, for it is very seldom that such examples can be found. They make possible a further completion of the affirmative paradigm, but indicate that *o nos* must have been one of the earliest forms to disappear; and therefore it is not surprising that we find no examples of it in *Aucassin et Nicolette* beside the more common form *oie*.

2. Naie

The negative form corresponding to *oie* is *naie*. It is entirely analogous to the affirmative form and etymologically is composed of *non* and *je* (Lat. NON EGO).[3]

[1] *Zeitsch. f. rom. Phil.*, 2: 171.

[2] Diez, 3: 319.

[3] Perle, in his article "Die Negation im Altfranzösischen" (*Zeitsch. f. rom. Phil.*, 2: 4) says: "opinions as to the origin of *naie* are very diverse and uncertain." The explanation given by G. Paris (*Romania* 7: 465) as to the development of *non je* into *naie* (the changing of *o* to *a* being exceptional) is, to my mind, the correct one. He says: "il est vrai que l'*a* est surprenant, d'autant qu'on ne trouve

Wherever used, it is the logically required form, which indicates that the significance of the pronoun (in other words, the etymological meaning) was clearly understood.[1] It may be used in answer to a question addressed in the second person singular or plural, or to a question addressed by the speaker to himself. For example:

"Aves vous nule connissance
De lui?" Dist li rois: "*Naie* voir."
—*Li Chev. as .ii. espees*, 2589-90.

"Have you any knowledge of him?" The king replied: "*Not I* truly."

"Estes espie ou traïtour
Qui si esgardez nostre tour?"
"Sire," dist il, "*naie*, par foi."
—*Floire et Blanceflor*, 1941-3.

"Are you a spy or a traitor that you so carefully examine our tower?" "Sire," he said, "*not I*, by my faith."

Or in answer to a question addressed in the singular:

"Et tu, venis tu ci er soir?"
Ce dist Robers: "*Naie* por voir."
—*Li Biaux Desconneus*, 5325-6.

---

ni *noje* ni *neje* qu'on attendrait, mais je suppose que *naje* est pour *nen je*, où *en* s'est d'abord changé en *ã*, puis a perdu la nasalisation." We may suppose that *nen je* (*nã jè*) is a weakened pronunciation of *non je* (cf. the frequent occurrence in O. Fr. of *en* for the indefinite pronoun *on*), and that *naje* is a confusion between *nen je* and the still further weakened *ne je*. The position of *naie* in the verse, wherever it is found, would indicate that, similarly to *oie*, the accent fell on the first syllable.

[1] M. Lucien Foulet (*Petite Syntaxe de l'anc. fr.*) says, p. 176, that the earlier meaning of the compound forms *nenil*, *naie*, had disappeared; to a great extent it had, and *nenil* was being used illogically for all the other forms including *naie*. The earlier meaning however, had not disappeared to such an extent that *naie* came to be used indiscriminately. The wording of M. Foulet's text would indicate (wrongly) that both were being used without reference to their earlier meaning: "Nos textes" (he says, with reference to those published in the series *Les Classiques français du Moyen Age*,) "ne connaissent pas la négation absolue *non*. Ils ne disent que *nenil*, ou moins souvent *naie*. On constate par l'emploi de ces composés que la signification première du pronom s'est oubliée."

"Did you come here last evening?" "*Not I*, in truth."

"Aimes tu Mahomet qui cest siecle gouverne?"
"*Naie*," che dist Elies.
—*Elie de Saint Gille*, 1412-3.

"Do you worship Mahomet?" "*Not I*," said Elie.

"Et creras tu en mon deu Tervagent?"
"*Naie*," dist-il, "ja ne vive jo tant."
—*Aspremont*, 5886-7.

"Will you believe in my god Tervagent?" "*Not I*, as long as ever I live."

Or in monologue, as emphatic negative:

"S'anemie mortel aura
Le jor que il m'espousera.
Comment verrai-je ja le jor!
Naie ja Dieux si lonc sejor
Ne me doinst que veir le puisse."
—*Le Vair palefroi.*

"And he will have a mortal enemy, the day he marries me. How shall I ever see that day. *Not I*, nor may God ever give me so long a sojourn here that I may see it."

"Ne quidies mie que j'atendisse tant que je trouvasse coutel dont je me peusce ferir el cuer et ocirre. *Naie* voir, tant n'atenderoie je mie, etc."
—*Aucassin et Nicolette*, xiv, 7-10.

"Think not that I should wait until I found a knife with which to pierce myself to the heart and kill myself. *Not I*, indeed, so long I should not wait, etc."

There was the same difficulty in conserving *naie* in the manuscripts as there was with the analogous form *oie*, and there is no doubt that copyists of later date, when *nenil* had supplanted all the other forms, inserted this form in place of *naie*. This is shown by an examination of the various manuscripts, for example, in *Yvain* (lines 5092-6):[1]

[1] From the edition of Foerster (Halle, 1887).

"Or me respondez, s'il vos plest,
Se vos venir i oseroiz
Ou se vos an reposeroiz!"
—"*Naie*," fet il, "de reposer
Ne se puet nus hom aloser. . . ."

The variants given by Foerster for line 5095 are: *Nenil, PG*; *Certes, V; Nai* (probably a copyist's error for *naie*), *H;* showing that if *naie* was the form used by Chrétien de Troyes, later copyists had altered it to *nenil*. Again in *Cligés* (Foerster) lines 496-7 we find:

"Dirai-je por ce que je l'aim?
Nenil, car ce seroit mançonge."

The variants given here are: *Naie, P; Noni, S.* A careful comparison however of *naje* and *nenil* as used by Chrétien in *Cligés* shows that he sometimes substitutes *nenil* for the logical *naje*, where it suits his purpose; for we find a few lines further on (503-4):

"Quel coupe et quel tort i ont il?
Doi les an je blasmer? *Nenil*."[1]

Nenil is illogical here and the etymological sense has evidently disappeared, since, by reason of the requirement of the rhyme, there is no possibility of substituting the primitive logical form. The fact remains that in line 497, where *nenil* is used in an exactly similar construction, the logical form does exist in at least one manuscript, as the variant indicates. One further example will show the tendency of *nenil* to supplant

[1] Despite this example of *nenil* used illogically by Chrétien de Troyes, the indications are that he used the logical form very frequently (this has already been said in regard to his use of *oie*), as we see all through the texts of his works that whenever it is a question of *nenil* used for *naie* in the printed text (the one consulted being that of Foerster) there is generally at least one known MS. which gives the logical *naie*. For a further example see lines 997-8:

"Comant? Proierai le je donques?
Nenil."

MSS. *P*, *R* both give *naie*.

naie in the manuscripts. This is found in *Le lai de l'Ombre* lines 802-3:[1]

> "Volez le me vous fere avoir
> A force?"—"*Naie*, bele amie.
> Bien sai tel pooir n'ai je mie."

This is the text as M. Bédier's edition reads, following his plan of reproducing a single selected manuscript. The variants which he indicates are: *naie* douce amie, *CF; naie* voir amie, *D*; *nenil* voir amie, *E; naie* voir dounce amie, *G*. This shows that every manuscript gives *naie* except that known as *E*, which gives *nenil*. One copyist has evidently made the substitution of *nenil* for *naie* and this can be cited as one of many instances in which a similar substitution has taken place.

The negative particle *non* was also used with the pronoun *je* in inverse order to that found in *naie*, viz., in the form *je non*.[2] This is quite similar to the Latin negative expression *ego non vero* (I indeed no), and was used for emphasis in Old French; but in this case the stress was on the negative word and thereby prevented the weakening of *non* to *nen*. This locution seems to have required a verb (understood) to complete the sense, as did the Latin negation where the verb in the question is repeated with affirmative or negative force in the answer. Two forms of this Latin negation have their survival in Old French; in the one case the

[1] Edited by M. Joseph Bédier in the *Anciens textes français*.

[2] Sometimes used instead of *naie:*

> "Donc n'es tu altrement navré
> Se del brief non ki t'a mostré
> Que Lavine te vuelt amer?"
> "*Ge non* . . . ne t'en deis pas clamer."
> —*Eneas*, 8977-80.

The alternative reading given among the variants of line 8980 is *naie*. The pronoun-feeling is present in either case, and indeed, this form *je non*, used, as here, interchangeably with *naie*, is an indication of the individual value of *je* in the latter form. Cf. with Old French *je non* the Spanish *Yo no*.

subject is expressed and the verb omitted (as in *je non*), while in the other the verb is expressed (for the most part a vicarious verb) and the subject omitted.

The following examples illustrate the first of these alternatives:

> . . . "Or ai si grant envie
> Que je seüsse vostre nom.
> Sire, diroiz le vos?" "*Je non.*"
> —*Chev. de la Charrette*, 1914-16.

"Now have I great desire to know your name, would you tell it to me, Sir?" "*I* (will) *not.*"

> "Sire," fet ele, "iestes vos mort?"
> "Damoisele," fet il, "*je non.*"
> —*Le Chev. à l'Epée*, 669-70.

"Sire, are you dead?" "My lady, *I* (am) *not.*"

> "Que dirai-je," fait ele, "primes?
> Apelerai le par son non
> Ou par ami? Ami? *Je non.*"
> —*Cligés*, 1392-4.

"Shall I call him by his name or as my loved one? Loved one? *I* (shall) *not*!"

Here the verbs *ferai, sui, ferai* respectively are understood after each expression *je non*. The second alternative with the verb expressed, is illustrated by the following:[1]

> . . . "dameisele, je croi
> a ces anseignes que je voi
> que chevalier(s) a eu ci."
> "—*Non a*, sire, jel vos afi,
> Mes un vaslet galois i ot."
> —*Percevaus li galois*, 165-9.

"Lady I believe, according to what I see, that there has been a knight here." "(There) *has not*, sire, I declare to you. . . ."

There occur further on, in line 381, two examples of

[1] The examples mentioned from *Percevaus li galois* are quoted from Foulet (*Petite Syntaxe*).

non ai, which correspond more exactly to the form *je non*. Both forms of this emphatic negative have concurred in giving the modern *non*—one by the suppression of the verb, the other by that of the pronoun.

Before terminating the enumeration of the negatives involving the first person pronoun, there may well be added one or two forms less usual than the regular *naie*, such as *naio* and *ne gié*. These can best be explained as more or less regional developments. "Latin *eo*, later *ieo*, becomes *gie*, *ge*, in Western, Central and Eastern France, and *jou*, *jo* in the North."[1] Nevertheless, both *naio* and *ne gié* give evidence of a strong stress on the personal pronoun. For example:

> "Reneward sire, par sainte charité
> Fustes vus unques baptizé ne levé?"
> —"*Naiio*," fait il, "par la fei que dei De."
> —*La Chançun de Willame*,[2] 3485-7.

"Reneward, were you ever baptized or raised before the font?" "*Not I*, by my faith."
and again:

> "Qui le conoist? *Ne gié, ne gié.*"
> —*Cligés*, 4679.

This latter example is an altogether special case in view of the form of the question: "*Who* knows him? *Not I, not I.*"[3] It doubtless represents the denial made by various speakers.

On scrutinizing these occurrences of the pronoun *je* in both affirmative and negative particles, we see that

[1] Quoted from Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. franz. Gram.*, p. 189, and his reference to Rydberg, *Zur Geschichte des französischen* ǝ (Upsala, 1907) 2: 619 ff.

[2] Miss E. L. Tyler's edition (Oxford University Press).

[3] I have come across a footnote in which Tobler (*Verm. Beiträge*, p. 3) has drawn attention to this unusual example, which he says, though unlike the other negative particles in sense, must be placed with them on account of its form: "Hier liegt Nachdruck auf dem pronominalem Subjekte. . . . Mit Bezug aber auf die Form der Negationspartikel ist diese Stelle den andern anzureihen."

their etymological significance was felt to a very marked degree even down to the end of the thirteenth century.[1] In addition to the examples already quoted, the following are cited as offering a comparatively full catalogue of the locution:[2]

"Aves de nule guere parler oi?"
"*O je*," dist li paumiers.
—*Aiol et Mirabel*, 1558-9, (Foerster).

"Aves vous relenqui Mahomet? fille belle?"
"*Oie*," che dist la dame.
—*Ibid.*, 9680-1.

"Oncles, vis tu, por Deu le raement?"
"*O je* voir, niés mais dolor ai molt grant."
—*Aspremont*, 6084-5. (*Class. fr.*).

Dist l'apostoles: "Te viés tu tant proisier
Que tu de nos soies cofanonier?"
"*O je*, voir, sire, jel demant et requier."
—*Ibid.*, 8452-4.

"Amis," dist Karles, "vels te tu si haster?"
"*O je*, voir, sire, molt le puis desirer."
—*Ibid.*, 7040-1.

"Veiz tu home qui me puist resambler?"
Dist li paumiers: "laissiez moi porpanser,
Oie," dist il, "or m'en sui ramenbrez."
—*Amis et Amiles*, 94-6.

Dist Vivien: "*Oie*, sï m'aït Damedeis."
Dist li Turs: "*Oie*, par Mahomet."
—*Le Chevalerie Vivien*, lines 968, and 971.

"Ies tu, va, crestiens de le malvaise geste
U se crois Mahomet qui le siècle gouverne?"
"*Naie*," che dist Elies, "mes en dieu le grand mestre."
—*Elie de Saint Gille*, 384-6.

---

[1] We find, for instance, *naie* in *Li Gieus de Robin et Marion* written by Adam le Bossu, as late as 1285-1288, during his sojourn in Italy:

"Di, Robin, veus tu plus mengier?"
"*Naie*, voir."
(Coussemaker's edition, p. 362).

[2] This collection of examples is not exhaustive, as I have had to limit myself to available texts. Nor does it include those examples of *oie* in Langlois' edition of *Le jeu de la Feuillée* restored by him where the sense alone—and not the MS. reading—required it.

"Quidies que fusse dont issi nonsaçant
K'a vostre cort venisse pour garant?
Naie! par dieu, le pire raement."
—*Huon de Bordeaux*, 1345-7.

"Sire," fait-il, "dites por l'amor Dé,
De Huelin, dites, feres vous el?"
"*Naie*!" dist Karles, "se me puist Dix salver."
—*Ibid.*, 2264-6.

"Por diu vous proi, sire, que n'i parles,
Se ne voles avuec lui demorer."
Et respont Hues: "*Naie*, si m'ait Dés."
—*Ibid.*, 3255-7.

"Le vous, bian sire, ne m'en savies mal gré,
Je vous diroie mon cuer et mon pensé."
Dist l'amires: "*Naie*, par verité."
—*Ibid.*, 6365-7.

"Apartiens tu Gandise l'amirant?"
"*Naie*," dist Hues, "li cors Dieu le cravant."
—*Ibid.*, 6510-11.

Dist Huelins: "Dont n'en feres vous el?"
"*Naie*," dist-il, "por noient em parles."
—*Ibid.*, 6624-5.

"Es tu paiens, Sarrasins ne Escler?"
"*Naie*," dist Hues, "Dix les puist craventes."
—*Ibid.*, 7689-90.

"Comment, es tu donc si coart?"
"Coarz? *nai* voir."
—*Renart*, 1: 2512-3.

Ce dist li angres: "ne te desesperer;
Mais or me di, garde nel me celer,
Se tu voldroies encores respasser."
"*Naie*," dist il, "mieus voldroie finer."
—*Amis et Amiles*, 2791.

"Amis biaus frere, li cors deu bien to donst.
Viz tu passer par ici un franc hom,
Qui me resamble d'aler et de fason?"
"*Naie* voir, sire," li bergers li respont.
Ibid., 154.

Lors prist a rire la pucele
Et dist: "Aves vous tel paour?"
Naie, dist ele, sans freor.
—*Li Chev. as .ii. Espees*, 1002.

"Estes vous point naures, nobile chevaliers?"
"*Naie*," che dist Aiols.
—*Aiol et Mirabel*, 6993.

"Sire," font-il, "estes bleciez?"
"*Naie*," fet-il, "j'ai pis eu."
—*Le Flabel D'Aloul*, 527.

Hane li Merchiers:
Pour le cul Dieu! estes vous ivres?
Maistres Henris:
Naie, je ne bui hui de vin.
—*Le jeu de la Feuillée*, 190-191.

"En alai jou si fait duel demenant?
Naie! par dieu, ains m'alai confortant."
—*Huon de Bordeaux*, 1299-1300.

"As tu de nul home talent?"
"*Naie* fors un, d'altre n'ai soing."
—Benoit de Sainte-Maure, *Eneas*, 8523.

"Ses tu," dist ele, "por coi m'estuet pasmer?"
"*Naie*," dist ele, "par Mahomet mon dé,"
—*Huon de Bordeaux*, 5691-2.

"Amis," dist ele, "dont n'en feres vous el?"
"*Naie*, voir, dame, par sainte carité."
—*Ibid.*, 5863-4.

"Venistes vos por truander?"
"*Naie*, ainz ving veoir vostre estre."
—*Renart.*

"Garin, car me di ore, garde ne me celer
Se tu es ens el cors ne ferus."
"*Naie*," dist Oliviers, "ja mar en mesquerres."
—*Fierabras*, 514-6; Guessard, *Anc. poètes de la France.*

"Comment verrai-je ja le jor!
Naie, ja Diex si lonc sejor
Ne me doinst que veir le puisse."
—*Fableau du Vair palefroi*, 607-9.

"Se j'ai mollier vos m'aves demandé;
Naie, ma dame, onques n'en oi pensé."
—*Aspremont*, 2650-1.

3. O VOS, NE VOS

Forms of the paradigm involving pronouns of the second person, are very rare in Old French texts. Fortunately they indicate, as do *oie* and *o nos*, that when used their original significance was fully understood.

Regarding the form *o tu* it must be said that the present writer has never seen it in any Old French text,

nor has it to his knowledge been quoted by anyone else. It should therefore be given as a conjectural form, **o tu*, until an example finally comes to light. Tobler postulated this form for the first time in his article of 1876, but characterized it along with *o nos*, *o elle*, *o vos*, as "*kaum aufzufinden.*" Foerster,[1] too, accepts it as a current form: "if the subject of the question is *je*, the answer must necessarily be *o tu* or *o vos*." He gives a reference to an example of *o vos* (*Zeits. für öster. gymn.*, 1875, p. 546) but no indication of one for *o tu*.

For examples of the negative form, *ne tu* or **nen tu*, the record is scarcely better. One single example of *ne tu*[2] has come to the writer's notice; but this does not quite form a parallel with the negatives we have so far considered (however closely it resembles them in form). This can be seen from the context, in which we do not have a case of the negative answer to a question but of a strong negative entreaty:

> "Vasal, di, qui es tu?
> Je t'ai jeté, ne sai se t'ai feru;
> Or te vuel traire, qe j'ai mon arc tendu."
> Et dist Ybert: "Amis frere, *ne tu.*"
> —*Raoul de Cambrai*, 1960-63.

Of the plural form *ne vos* (or *ne vus*) there are fortunately more examples to bring forward:

> "Hé baron! qar me dites, ne vos tort à enois,
> Porroie-je garir se creoie an vo lois?"
> "*Ne vos*," dist Baudequins, "jà mar an parlerois."
> Jean Bodel, *La Chanson des Saxons*, I: 258.[3]

"Could I get well if I believed in your religion?"
"*Not you*," said Baudequins.

[1] *Op. cit.*, *Zeits. f. r. Phil.*, 2: 171.

[2] Already quoted by Foerster, *op. cit.*, and by Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.*, p. 2.

[3] Published by Francisque Michel, Paris, 1839; this example has already been quoted by Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.*, p. 3.

"Biax rois," fait Elyas, "ai jo de rien mespris?"
"*Ne vos*," ce dist li rois, "Elyas biax amis."
—*La Chanson du Chevalier au cygne*, 63-64.[1]

"Gentle king, have I aught mistaken?" "*Not you*, gentle friend," said the king.

These two examples are quite parallel to the form *naie*, and as such are more distinctly negative particles than the form *ne tu* just given. A rather interesting example of *ne vus* occurs in *La Chanson de Roland* (lines 567-8):

"Puis m'en cumbatre a Carle et a Franceis?"
Guenes respunt: "*Ne vus* a ceste feiz."[2]

"Can I fight Charles and the French?" "*Not you* this time."

There remains the affirmative particle *o vos*. Mention has already been made of such an example found by Foerster; to this we can add the following from the *Roman de Tristan* of Béroul[3] (lines 682-692):

"Beaus niés," fait il, "je vos requier,
Ma volenté faites, gel vuel.
Au roi Artus, jusqu'a Carduel,
Vos covendra a chevauchier.
Cel brief li faites desploier.
Niés, de ma part le saluez,
O lui c'un jor ne sejornez."
Du mesage ot Tristran parler,
Au roi respont de lui porter:
"Rois, ge irai bien par matin."
"*O vos*, ainz que la nuit ait fin."

Tristan is commissioned by the king to go to Arthur's court, and on receiving his orders, says to him: "My

[1] Paris 1874; quoted by Tobler, *op. cit.*

[2] Quoted by Foerster *op. cit.*, from the edition by Francisque Michel, Paris 1869. This is also the reading in Gautier's edition. On the other hand those of Clédat and Müller give the reading: "Ne mie a ceste feiz." As both expressions are known to Old French there are grounds for supporting either. Foerster strongly advocates the former, as quoted above.

[3] *Classiques fr.*, edited by Ernest Muret.

lord, I shall leave at early morning." "*That you* (will) before the night is gone."[1]

Although *o vos* here merely illustrates the use of the affirmative particle in a corroborative sense, it is nevertheless a very important example.[2] A second instance of *o vos* is found in manuscript *C* of the *Coronemenz Loois*,[3] (lines 1551-2):

> Et dit Aliaumes: "Irai jou dont tous sous?"
> "*O vos*, biaus niés, en vo main un baston."

And Alelme said: "Shall I go all alone?" "*That you* (will), gentle nephew, with a staff in your hand."

This reading has not been incorporated by the editor (M. Langlois) in his critical constitution of the poem, but it appears in a passage given in an appendix. It has been seen how M. Langlois has paid particular attention to the affirmative particle in *Le Jeu de la Feuillée* with special reference to the form *oie*;[4] also that he has in two cases restored *oie* in his recent edition of *Li Coronemenz Looïs*,[5] where the reading was *oïl* in the edition of 1888 (*Anciens textes*). The retention therefore of *oïl* as the reading in the above-quoted passage even in the later edition (*Class. fr.*, 1920)[6] and the relegation of the form *o vos* to the list of variants (see page 121 of that edition) can be accounted for

[1] Cf. the significance of this example of *o vos* with the corresponding "strong negative entreaty" of the expression *ne tu* just quoted.

[2] It is strange that M. Lucien Foulet has made no mention of this case in his reference to the affirmative (*Petite Syntaxe de l'ancien français*) particularly as the *Tristran* of Béroul is taken from the series of Old French texts (*Class. fr. du moyen âge*) on which he bases his study.

[3] *Anc. textes fr.*, edited by M. E. Langlois, p. 139. Of MS. *C.* M. Langlois says: "Ce manuscrit est dû à un scribe picard, qui souvent ne comprenait pas ce qu'il écrivait; il a donc beaucoup de fautes. Néanmoins il fournit souvent la bonne leçon."

[4] See above, p. 44.

[5] *Classiques français*, see also p. 45.

[6] Respont Allelmes: "Irai je donc toz sols?"
"*Oïl*, bels frere, en vo main un baston." (Lines 1788-9).

either as an inconsistency or as being a case in which first-hand knowledge of the various manuscripts has given the editor sufficient grounds for not using the logical form. In any case the reading of manuscript *C* is of special interest in a study of the affirmative particle, and, being perfectly logical, would seem to be preferable to the form *oïl*.[1]

This completes the list of recognized affirmative and negative forms involving the pronouns of the first and second persons. We have seen that without a single exception they have been found occurring in accordance with their etymological sense; that the pronoun in the affirmative (or negative) corresponds in each case to the pronoun in the question, as indicated in the illustrative examples of our type-paradigm. This fact demonstrates clearly the precision with which these forms were understood and employed throughout the early period of the language; they were affirmative (or negative) locutions, with certain and well-defined meanings to fit particular contexts. They are therefore, taken together, self-explanatory as to their origin, and in turn explain clearly the derivation of the forms *oïl*, *nenil*, concerning which there exists no little confusion and uncertainty among those not directly interested in syntactical philology.[2] This etymological significance is gradually lost in the affirmatives of the *third person*, and confusion in their use is early manifested.

Before taking up the generalized forms *oïl* and *nenil* we shall endeavour to dispose of the neuter forms *oel*, *oal*, *nenal*, etc. They too finally disappear, along with the forms of the first and second persons.

[1] In addition to the examples of *o vos* given above, and to the one referred to by Foerster, we might quote the similar construction in Provençal given by Diez (3:319): "Poyray m'i fizar?" "*Oc vos.*" (*Parnasse occitanien*, 171).

[2] One editor of Marivaux's comedy *Le jeu de l'amour et du hasard*, gives a note on the negative *nenni* by quoting from Littré: "Nenni 'No.' An antiquated negative particle, coming from NON ILLUD, as HOC ILLUD gave *oïl* > *oui*."

4. Oel, Nenal

Oel is to be understood as derived from the Latin HOC ILLUM[1] (ILLUM for ILLUD). In its variant form *oal*, the opening of the vowel sound *e* to that of *a* is a phenomenon that is not uncommon.[2] This latter form, through metathesis, becomes in some cases *aol*. A corresponding change of *e* to *a* occurs also in the negative particles, the commonest form being *nenal* instead of *nenel*. These particles present some noteworthy characteristics. In the first place, being composed of *o* or *nen* plus a *neuter* pronoun, the *personal* (masculine or feminine) feeling does not exist. The affirmative paradigm must be extended therefore to embrace not only the personal pronouns masculine and feminine, but also a neuter pronoun of the third person. Secondly, they are distinctly regional, being found for the most part in manuscripts emanating from the west and northwest of France, where the neuter pronoun *el* was generally used.[3] As we have seen, *il* was the usual neuter form elsewhere.[4] (Horning, in his study of the

[1] Concerning the place of *el* = ILLUM in the Old French dialects, see G. Paris (*Romania*, 23: 165-7).

[2] *e* > *a* before *l* or *r*. Cf. Fr. *clerc*, English *clerk*, pronounced in the British Isles *clark*. See Nyrop, I, pp. 180-1, and Chaps. XV and XVI. Cf. also Brunot, I, p. 158. The *Atlas linguistique* (Fasc. 1404), indicates that the fem. pronoun *elle*, for instance, is pronounced *al*, *a*, throughout the greater part of Northern France. The former pronunciation holds good especially in the Departments of Nord, Somme, Oise, Aine.

[3] See Gaston Paris (*Romania* 23: 163-4). He quotes Settegast's study of the language of Benoit de Sainte-More, which shows the frequent use of *el* (*eu*) in the *Chronique*, especially as regards the MS. *T* (that of Tours). He also quotes glossaries of modern patois in Poitou, Saintonge, and Aunis, indicating the existence up to the present day of such forms as *el*, *al*, *ol*, in which he sees remnants of the Latin neuter ILLUM (=ILLUD).

[4] Cf. *ibid.*: G. Paris says, "Il est vrai que de très bonne heure, en France propre, en Normandie, en Picardie, en Champagne et en Lorraine, l'ancien *el* comme sujet des verbes impersonnels, avait été remplacé par le masc. *il*;" that is, of course, if it ever existed at all

neuter pronoun *il*, does not mention the existence of the form *el*, cf. p. 17). Thirdly, *oel* and *nenal* resemble *oïl* inasmuch as, being used without reference to their etymological sense, they threatened to crowd out the other forms, and to become the general affirmative and negative particles in the districts in which they were used. Their use with reference to impersonal expressions (cf. p. 18, n. 1) would make this result a natural one. It is interesting to note what Gaston Paris says in this regard:

> Les exemples de *aol* et de *oal* prouvent que *oel* ne se restreignait pas à la réponse à une question dont le verbe était un verbe impersonnel, mais que, peu à peu, et précisément par son caractère impersonnel qui lui permettait de s'adapter à toutes les questions, il était devenu une réponse affirmative générale. Quand le masc. *il* eut remplacé dans la France propre comme ailleurs (sauf à l'ouest) le neutre *el*, il se substitua pareillement à *el* ou à ses variantes dans la combinaison avec *o*, et ainsi *oïl* signifia également HOC ILLE, HOC ILLI et HOC ILLUD, ce qui explique qu'il soit arrivé encore plus complètement qu'*oel* à jouer le rôle d'une réponse affirmative générale. Mais on voit que ce rôle avait été d'abord tenu par *oel* ou ses variantes et aurait bien pu l'être définitivement, en sorte que la langue française, au lieu de s'appeler la 'langue d'oïl,' faillit sans doute de bien près s'appeler la 'langue d'aoul.'[1]

We might feel tempted to modify to a slight degree the last remark in the foregoing. That *oel* had first filled the rôle of a general affirmative, to be later supplanted by *oïl*, is hardly likely except for a very small portion of the country (*i.e.*, in the extreme western part); at least, there is no support for such a theory in the texts that have come down to us. *Il* neuter had come into general use probably at a time when the affirmative still retained the pronoun feeling and in that case *oïl* would be considered the logical form

---

in the provinces mentioned, as impersonal verbs do not seem to have taken a pronoun subject till after the development of *il* as a neuter pronoun. Paris says elsewhere (*Rom.* 24: 310) that the mod. Wallon form *awe* = *oui* would seem to preserve the old form *oel* in the district around Liége.

[1] *Romania* 23: 168.

in all instances requiring the neuter pronoun in the affirmative particle.[1] Thus, in the greater part of France, *oïl* was the form of the affirmative particle most often heard. We may therefore, if we like, amend the supposition of a 'langue d'aoul' *instead of a* 'langue d'oïl,' to the surmise that the prevalence of *oel* and its variants in a small part of France might easily have given rise to the designation 'langue d'aoul' for the dialect of that region *in addition to* that of 'langue d'oïl' for French in general. As to the origin of the expressions 'langue d'oïl,' 'langue d'oc,' 'langue de si,' we can make only conjectures, but the most likely supposition would make them the first means of indicating the growing diversity of language spoken throughout France, Italy and Spain owing to the rapid developments of the basic language known as Vulgar Latin.[2] This diversity was indicated, then, by the several ways in which people said 'yes.' If the man in Provence answered in the affirmative by *oc*, and the man in the Ile de France by *oïl*, and if their respective dialects were named accordingly, it is just possible that the fact that the man in the west of France said *aoul* for 'yes' might have given rise to the expression 'langue d'aoul.' To say that this expression nearly became the synonym for the language spoken in the north of France, as Gaston Paris suggests, would perhaps be to exaggerate the prevalence of this form of the affirmative. *Oal* and its variants were not generally used, being confined to a few dialects, and examples of them in the texts are comparatively rare. A few of these may be here cited:

---

[1] See below, pp. 75 ff.

[2] They seem however not to have been much used before the end of the thirteenth century; cf. Dante, *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, and see Brunot, *Hist. de la langue fr.* I:304. Brunot here gives the earliest date as 1291.

"Sire, jo vieg de France le roial
U jo ai traite tante paienne et tant mal
Montes ai tiertre et avalé tant val."
"Veis tu Carle?" "Par Mahomet *oal*."
—*Aspremont*, 562-5.

"Did you see Charlemagne?" "Yes, by Mahomet."

An etymological translation of the affirmative is impossible in this instance, *oal* being a general affirmative particle. Its form however is attested by the assonance; this implies that even if *oal* had ceased to be a current form by the time the *Chanson d'Aspremont* was written, the poet knew that it had been used at some time or other, and could be called into use here to serve the purpose of the assonance in *-al*. Poetry, the language of archaisms, would make this quite possible. The reason for supposing that *oal* here is either an archaism or a dialectal form is that it occurs in only a single instance in the course of the poem.

The next example is a curious variation of the rather fixed expression *ne o ne non* and shows also a striking juxtaposition of *oal* (neuter) and *nenil* (masc. or perhaps rather a different form of the neuter) which indicates the existing confusion in regard to these particles, especially in the case of the neuter pronouns:

Et se l'en demandant lor vait
Se le bien firent qu'il ont fait,
N'en dient *oal* ne *nenil*,
Mes Dex le set, seignors, font il.
Le Chastoiement d'un père à son fils, 157-160.[1]

"They answer neither *yes* nor *no*."

A further example is quoted by Burguy taken from *Les quatre livres des Rois*[2] (p. 90):

[1] Quoted from Burguy, *Gram. de la langue d'oïl*, 2: 310.
[2] Published by Le Roux de Lincy; Paris, 1841.

"E liverunt mei li burgeis de Ceila e ces ki od mei sunt en la main Saul?" Respundi nostre Seignur: "*Oal*, il te liverunt."

The answer to the question "Will the burghers deliver me?" is "*Yes*, they will deliver you."[1]

The variant form *aol* was also prevalent in certain parts of Western France. Gaston Paris cites an interesting example which accentuates the fact that it was merely local in use:

Franceis, qui moreient d'ennui,
Li distrent: "Leverez vos hui?"
Il dist: "*Aol*." Et de nullui
N'ont Franceis *aol* fors de lui.[2]

This form also appears, in the rhyme, in the *Fabliau de la dame escoliée*:[3]

"Que t'a dit li quens?"—"Que savors
Li face bones et plusors."
"Vielz avoir mon gré?"—"Dame *aol*."
"Garde que il n'i ait un sol
Où il ait savors fors ailliée."

A third form of the neuter affirmative, *aoul*, already

[1] Godefroy gives two instances of *oal* (under *oïl*) taken from *Prothesilaus:*

"Vassal, est issi cum vos dites?"
"Dame, *oal*, ore en seez quites."

"Belz nez, fait ele, est il en vie?"
"Madame, *oal*, mes fieblement."

[2] G. Paris's note is as follows: "Cet *aol* paraît avoir été une forme proprement française, dont les Normands, qui ne connaissaient plus qu' *oïl*, se moquaient. André de Coustances, racontant vers 1205 à sa façon, le fabuleux combat d'Arthur et du roi de France Frolles, écrit ces vers, qui semblaient sans doute fort plaisants à ses auditeurs normands." Being unable to consult the text, I give the reference according to Paris: Jubinal, *Nouveau Recueil*, 2: 6. It is difficult, however, to reconcile this comment with the four lines quoted. It would seem from their content that the expression *aol* was the Norman term which sounded strangely in the ears of the French: "He answered *aol;* and from no-one have the French heard *aol* except from him."

[3] *Recueil général*, 6: 106.

quoted by Gaston Paris (*op. cit.*, p. 167) appears twice in *l'Escoufle*:[1]

> ". . . il n'a si preu ne si biele,
> Si com on dist, en tot le raine,
> Et dist qu'ele est de Loeraine;
> S'a non biele Aelis de Toul."
> "*Puet* estre voirs?"[2] "Par Dieu, *aoul*."

"They say that she comes from Lorraine and that her name is Aelis of Toul." "Can this be truth?" "By heaven, *that it* (can)."

> ". . . Comment avés a non?"
> "Guilliaumes." "Dont?" "Sire, de Toul."
> "En est *ce* en Loherrainne?" "*Aoul*."

"What is your name?" "William." "From whence come you?" "From Toul, sir." "Is *that* (*ce* neuter) in Lorraine?" "*That it* (is)."

These are the only examples of the neuter form of the affirmative known to the writer, that can be translated literally with perfect good sense. They illustrate clearly the origin of the neuter particle, which must have been at one time limited to the answering of neuter constructions such as we see in these two passages of *L'Escoufle: puet estre voirs?* and *est-ce en Loherrainne?*[3]

For the corresponding negative form, *nonal*,[4] *nenal* (or *nanal*, seemingly by the attraction of the tonic vowel) there exist several examples, most of which are confirmed by the rhyme:

[1] *Anc. textes*, (1894).

[2] In this construction, *voirs*, with its nominative masc. *s*, is probably the adjective used as a noun.

[3] For the form *ol* cited by Burguy, G. Paris (*op. cit.*, p. 167, n. 2) says that it must be nothing more than a copyist's error. I can give no better explanation than this.

[4] It is a significant fact that to-day the negative particle in the patois of a few localities in the Department of Ille-et-Vilaine is *nonna* (see Gilliéron, *Atlas linguistique*, Fas. 922).

"Dame," fait il, "ou est m'amie?"
Cele respont: "El n'i est mie."
"Ou est?" "Ne sai." "Vous l'appelez."
"Ne sai quel part." "Vous me gabez.
Celez la vous?" "Sire, *nonal.*"
"Par Diu," fait il, "con est gieu (grant) mal."
—*Floire et Blanceflor*, 673-8.

"Are you keeping her from me?" "*No*, sir."

"Ne sai se vous nos feres mal"
Dist Blancandins: "Sire *nonal.*"
—*Blancandins*, 2841-2.

"I do not know whether you will do us harm." "*No* sir," said Blancandin.

Two Anglo-Norman poems of the thirteenth century, *Josaphaz* and *Le petit plet*,[1] furnish several instances of the neuter negative particle which it may be well to quote here:

Josaphaz dit: "Or losengez!
Cuvent a tuz tens devenir?"
"*Nenal*," fet cil. . . .
—*Josaphaz*, 608-10.

"Vus estes Barlaam, le maufe."
"*Nenal*," fet cil, "mes le serf de."[2]
—*Ibid.*, 1335-6.

"Dunc tenez vus veillesce a mal?"
L'enfant respunt: "Sire, *nanal.*"
——*Le petit plet*, 599-600.[3]

These examples indicate from the context that *nenal*, as here used, is no more than a general negative particle, to be understood without regard to the original meaning of the word. As such they cannot be rendered into English except by 'no.' The etymological signifi-

[1] Edited by John Koch in the *Altfranzösische Bibliothek*, vol. I, Heilbronn 1879.

[2] The variant in *O* is *nenil*. For a third example im this poem see line 1426.

[3] Further examples are found in lines 255, 1009, 1159 and 1621.

cance however is clearly implied in the following passage from *La Chançun de Willame*, with which we may terminate the discussion of this form of the paradigm:

"Dame," dist-il, "ia(s) c'est un bageler
Uns ioefnes hom que Deus m'ad amené."
"Sire" dist ele "estuet le nus doter?"
"*Nenal*, veir, dame, ben i poez parler."

"Sir," said she, "is it necessary for us to fear him?" "*Not it*, indeed, lady."

It may not be too much to suppose with regard to this last example that in using the form *nenal*, the speaker was conscious of its relation to the impersonal verb *estuet*.

5. O IL

The paradigm of the affirmative particle is completed by the addition of those forms which involve the masculine[1] pronouns (singular and plural) of the *third person*. These were identical forms in Old French, namely, *oïl*; and for this reason *oïl*, in a literal translation, is the equivalent not only of 'that he' but of 'that they.' This identity in form of *oïl* = HOC ILLI[2] (= classical Lat.

[1] The feminine pronoun *ele* is not found in connection with the affirmative particle. There is no reason to doubt that it actually existed at an early period of its development. As we have seen, Tobler has postulated it, and Darmesteter includes the forms *o elle* and *o elles* in his hypothetical paradigm. I feel that these should be included as conjectural forms along with **o tu* in a table of the various forms of the Old French affirmative. It is worthy of note that the forms *oel*, *nenel* were probably pronounced exactly the same as the hypothetical feminine forms **o ele*, **nen ele*. In accordance with Gilliéron's theory of the breaking down of the spoken language where two words originally different in sound (in this case ILLUD and ILLA) reduce to a single sound, we have here a possible explanation of the disappearance of the feminine form in the affirmative and negative particles.

[2] Folk speech form, see Chapter I, p. 18, n. 1. Latin HOC ILLI > *oc-il*. An original affirmative particle *oc-il* would become *oïl* through a palatalization of *c* before *i*. Cf. Meyer-Lübke (*Hist. franz. Gram.*, p. 143).

HOC ILLE) and of *oïl*=HOC ILLI making it the logical form in two contexts where all the other forms of the affirmative were logical in but one, is given quite reasonably enough as the cause of *oïl* crowding out the less used forms and finally supplanting them entirely. That is to say, when a person wished to say 'yes,' although he had the whole paradigm at his disposal, he found (unconsciously) that the word *oïl* was the one most often required; this would naturally lead to a use of *oïl* in a mistaken sense for other less used forms; and so the process of assimilation progressed with the result that *oïl* was in many parts of France a generalized affirmative even at the time of our earliest written testimony of it in the language. It is therefore impossible to determine which of the many cases in Old French texts where *oïl* fits the context retain their etymological meaning in the consciousness of the speaker and which of them are merely accidentally logical in use.[1] In examining the following examples, however, a literal translation will be adhered to in order to illustrate more clearly the influences that led to the predominance of *oïl* over the other forms:

"Fu il i lors, quant je i fui?"
"*Oïl*, meis ne le coneüstes."
—*Gligés*, 5214-5.

"Was he there when I was?" "*That he* (was), but you did not recognize him."

Here the literal translation is also the logical one; similarly in the following examples:

"A il dunc mais?" dist Reneward le ber.
"*Oïl*, veirs, quatre, que mult devez amer."
—*La Chançun de Willame*, 3055-6.

"Has he more then?" said Reneward. "*That he* (has) indeed, four, whom you must love well."

[1]Just as in Mod. French *oui* is often the exact historical form required to fit the context, e.g., *a-t-il bien fait?—Oui.*

"Pense il que n'en ait pechié?"
"Certes, *oïl*, n'i faudra mie."
—*Tristran* (Béroul), 146-7.

"Does he think that he has not sinned in doing so?" "*That he* (does) certainly, he will not fail to do so."

"Comant? Viaut donc Yvains ocirre
Mon seignor Gauvain, son ami?"
"*Oïl* et il lui autresi."
—*Yvain*, 6070-2.

"What! Does Yvain wish then to kill my lord Gauvain his friend?" "*That he* (does)."

"Est-il jevene?" "*Oïl* assez."
"Vet-il bien, par amours?"
"*Oïl*, pis de nuit que de jours."
"Mange il bien?" . . .
"*Oïl*,"
—*Le Roi d'Angleterre et le Jongleur.*

"Is he young?" "*That he* (is) quite." "Does he see well, pray?" "*That he* (does), not so well at night as by day." "Does he eat well?" "*That he* (does)."

These examples will suffice to illustrate *oïl* used logically in reply to a question demanding an answer with reference to the pronoun of the third person singular. The following show how *oïl* also fitted a context with reference to the third person plural:

"Dites, biaus nies, por Deu qui tot forma,
S'arment vos gens? Ne l' me celes vos ja."
"*Oïl* voir Sire, molt d'armés en i a."
—*Girard de Viane*, p. 114.

"Tell me, gentle cousin, are your followers taking up arms?" "*That they* (are) indeed, Sire."

"Comant, por Deu, sont il donc troi?"
"*Oïl*, sire, a la moie foi."
—*Yvain*, 3617-8.

"What, by Heaven, are they then three in number?" "*That they* (are) sir, by my faith."

"Te prometent-il tant d'avoir
Com tu me vas ci acontant?"
"*Oïl* biaux frère."
—*Estormi*, 42-4.

"Do they promise you as much as you are telling me?" "*That they* (do), gentle brother."

The pronoun *il* was by no means restricted in Old French to the *masculine*. It had already come to be used in a neuter sense as subject of impersonal constructions. The explanation of *il* neuter in Old French has been very well set forth by Horning.[1] He accounts for it as being a "passing of the *masculine* form *il* to be used in *impersonal* constructions." He says by way of proof:

Il existe dans la langue une locution au moyen de laquelle on peut montrer d'une manière frappante le passage de *il* masc. à *il* neutre. . . . C'est la locution: *il est qui*, qui signifie *il y a quelqu'un qui*. . . . *Il est qui* répond exactement au latin ILLE EST QUI: *il* est donc bien ici pronom masculin; il serait même impossible de rendre *il est qui* par ILLUD EST QUI: ce serait un non-sens barbare. Bientôt on ne sentit plus dans *il est* le pronom masculin dans sa force primitive, *il est* devint une locution toute faite, synonyme du latin EST.

This transition he places about the middle of the eleventh century, basing his proof solely upon material found in the texts. Whether this date is exact or not, the fact that the form *il* was used as a neuter pronoun in many parts of France is the all-important point. Horning's whole article tends to prove that in the affirmative particle *oïl*, *il* was *not* originally a neuter pronoun:

Nous admettons que dans *oïl*, *il* ait été pronom masc. singulier ou pluriel, mais non pas que cet *il* ait pu être également pronom neutre, du moins à l'époque la plus ancienne. Plus tard, de même que *oïl* s'est dit pour *oie*, *o tu*, etc., il s'est dit aussi pour *o ce*.

Horning would have been more exact, consistently with his own procedure (that of examination of the

[1] *Le pronom neutre* il *en langue d'oïl; Romanische Stud.*, 4: 229 ff.

texts), if he had said *o el* instead of *o ce*. We might add however that, whereas the supplanting of the forms *oie*, **o tu*, etc., by *oïl* came *after* the pronominal significance had altogether disappeared, it is not only quite possible but extremely probable that the supplanting of *oel* by *oïl* came *before* that had occurred. There is no decisive proof for this supposition known to the present writer, but a further remark of Horning helps to support it. He says (p. 271):

> Dans une série d'expressions telles que *ce plaît, ce est droit, ce pèse, ce arrive*, l'ancienne langue mettait à volonté *ce* ou *il*, ou plutôt *il* pouvait s'y substituer à *ce*. Mais dans les locutions impersonnelles proprement dites, et dans les propositions où *il* neutre précède le sujet, jamais *il* n'a pu être remplacé par *ce*, jamais on n'a dit *ce y a, ce fait chaud, ce pleut, ce arrive un homme*, pour *il y a, il fait chaud*, etc., ce qui montre bien que la langue avait un vif sentiment de la différence originelle des deux pronoms.

If therefore, in Old French they said *il pluet* and not *ce pluet* we see that in answer to the question *pluet-il? oïl* must be looked upon as being the perfectly logical form of affirmative reply. It would be difficult to say whether, by virtue of being the affirmative in both singular and plural of the third person, *oïl* had already become a generalized affirmative particle *before* the appearance in the language of *il* as *neuter* pronoun, or, whether *il* was at one time *felt* to be neuter in *oïl* used with reference to impersonal verbs. We are inclined to believe that the latter hypothesis is the more likely, for the following reason: it has been seen that in those portions of Western France where *el* remained longest as the neuter pronoun, the neuter or impersonal form of the affirmative became the generalized form; is there not, therefore, good reason to suppose that in those districts where the neuter pronoun came to be *il* the neuter form of the affirmative particle would also tend to become the generalized form? If this supposition has any weight, we have a second very good explanation as to why *oïl* was the form of affirmation destined to survive.

An examination of a few instances in which *oïl* is used in reply to impersonal constructions, will show that it must be taken as being the logical form of affirmation required:

"Car me di,
Vallet, se *il* a pres de ci
Recet ne ville ne manoir
U nous geussions." "*Oïl* voir."
—*Li Chevalier as .ii. espees*, 8569-72.

"Now tell me, if *there is* nearby a village or manor where we may take shelter." "*That there* (is), indeed."

"Por Deu," fet il, "biaus douz chiers sire,
Ice *pleiroit* vos *il* a dire
Por quoi m'avez tant enoré
Et tant fet joie et tant ploré?"
"*Oïl* s'il vos vient a pleisir."
—*Yvain*, 3835-9.

"In Heaven's name," said he, "fair sir, would it please you to tell me why you have so honoured me. . . ?" "*That it* (would), if it happens to be your pleasure."

"Et comment
Va ce dont? N' *a il* gent laiens?"
"*Oïl*, asses."
—*Le Chevalier as .ii. espees*, 9444-6.

"Are there not people inside?" "*That there* (are)—many."

In these examples the *il* of *oïl* might correspond quite logically in thought to the neuter *il* subject of the verbs *a* and *pleiroit*. In the former, the pronoun subject (whenever expressed) was always *il*, as Horning says, but in the latter, the subject might be *ce*. This leads to a further question: Could *oïl* be logical in answer to a question whose subject is *ce*?

The affirmative answer to an expression with *ce* as subject is regularly *oïl* in Old French except where *oel* was the local form. It is then quite possible that *oïl* was felt to be the logical answer in such cases:

Isaias: Ço que ait dit est prophecie.
Judeus: En livre *est* ecrit?
Isaias: *Oïl*, de vie
Ne l' sonjai pas, ainz l'ai veü.
—*Mystère d'Adam.*

"What has been said is prophecy." "Is it written testimony?" "*That it* (is), I did not dream it, but saw it."

"Queus mervoille est ce que je voi?
N'est ce Cligés?" "*Oïl*, par foi."
—*Cligés*, 6453-4.

"What marvel is this I see? Is it not Cligés?" "*That it* (is), by my faith."

"Est-ce amors? *Oïl* ce croi."
—*Cligés*, 926.

"Is it love? *That it* (is), I believe."

"Est-ce dont voirs?" dist li rois Loeys.
"*Oïl* biax sire," li messaiges a dit.
—*Raoul de Cambrai*, 6722-3.

"Is it true then?" said king Louis. "*That it* (is), sire," said the messenger.

If the *il* in *oïl*, therefore, is accepted as being sometimes neuter, there are, in all, four occurrences in which *oïl* can be considered as a logical answer, instead of the two generally accepted.[1] *Oïl* was in any case more often used than any other form of the paradigm, and the language may easily have been designated as the 'langue d'oïl' before the entire disappearance of the other forms (*oie*, *o nos*, *o vos*, etc.).

There remain a few isolated instances which are interesting in so far as they show how natural was the

[1] The two cases referred to are the third person singular and plural. Tobler translated *oïl*, however, as "yes he, yes they, yes it." The four cases we have summed up refer to *oïl* as logical answer to a question whose subject is *il* (masc. sing. and plural), *il* neuter and finally *ce*.

tendency to use *oïl* as affirmative particle to the exclusion of the other forms:

"Messager frère, dites vos vérité
Que Sarrazin sont en ma terre entré?"
"*Oïl* voir Sire, le pais est gasté."
—*Girard de Viane*, p. 179.

"Messenger, do you say with truth that the Infidels have invaded my territory?" "*That they* (have) indeed, Sire, the country is devastated." The question is really 'do you say truly?' to which *oïl* is an illogical answer; but the question uppermost in the speaker's mind is undoubtedly 'Have the infidels invaded my country?' The answer then is illogical from the syntactical point of view, but logical in so far as it answers the question most important at the moment. We can imagine many cases similar to this one, where *oïl* was used illogically by attraction; for example:

"Comment? dites vous que li rois
Voist par ceste forest esrant?"
"*Oïl* voir, car il va querant
Le Chevalier as .ii. espees."
—*Le Chev. as .ii. esp.*, 8546-9.

"What? Do you say that the king is wandering through this forest?" "*That he* (is) indeed, for he is seeking the Knight of the Two Swords."

Here again *oïl* is grammatically illogical, yet one is evidently entitled to disregard the matter of syntax in accounting for the final predominance of this particle. There is no doubt that the point uppermost in the speaker's mind was not 'yes, I say so,' but 'yes, the king is in the forest,' because the question was not so much 'do *you* say' as it was '*is* the king wandering through the forest?' We can readily imagine how difficult it would be to keep the two points in mind, as a literal substitution for *oïl* in line 8548 will show: '*o je*, voir, car *il* va querant,' '*that I* (do), for *he* is seeking.' This divides the thought between the speaker

and the subject to which he refers whereas the answer in the text directs the thought solely to the subject-matter.

Before the end of the thirteenth century the *o* in *oïl* is already being written *ou*, but the final *-l* still remains:

Marote: Robin, par l'âme ton père
Ses tu fere le touret?
Robin: *Ouil* par l'âme ma mère.
—*Marion et Robin.*

The final *-l* disappears comparatively early, however[1]:

2e Gallant: Et moy? Sentai-ge mon village
A vostre aduys?
1e Gallant: Il semble *ouy.*
—*Les trois gallants et Phlipot.*

It is of course impossible to point to any precise date when *oïl* became the general affirmative particle in Old French. This date would vary in different districts and different dialects. The etymological meaning of the affirmative persisted longer in Picardy than anywhere else: as we have seen, the most fruitful source of first and second person forms is in the manuscripts emanating from Picardy and adjacent parts. The influence of the neuter *il* in determining the final supremacy of *oïl* has been suggested as a parallel to

[1] This raises an interesting point, which M. Paul Passy has strongly emphasized, concerning the pronunciation of the pronoun *il* in Modern French. His contention is that the sounding of the *l* is a modernism brought about by grammarians, and that historically it had long since disappeared altogether in speech, remaining in the spelling probably through use in liaison. Our present-day pronunciation of the affirmative *oui* seems to bear out this contention. Here we have the combination of *o* with *il*, or *ou-il* where the final *-l* not only disappeared from pronunciation but also from the spelling as early as the fourteenth century. It is hardly likely that it disappeared here and not from *il* as subject of a verb. The grammarians who resuscitated the pronunciation of the final *-l* in the pronoun, omitted to treat the affirmative particle in a similar way, and thus it remains as seeming testimony in support of Passy's hypothesis.

the fact that the neuter form *oel* became the generalized form in certain districts where *el* as neuter survived. The writer is inclined to stress this point as very important, although it has apparently been overlooked in other explanations as to why *oïl* was the form destined to remain. The neuter idea in *oïl* = "that it" would make this form a convenient affirmative for answering in accordance with the *thought* rather than with the syntactical structure of the sentence, as, for example, in the following:

> "Mes, se vous fetes mon devis,
> Ne porrez pas faillir à moi."
> "*Oïl*, damoisele, par foi,"
> Fet li chevaliers.
> —*Le vair Palefroi*, 396-9.

"But, if you take my advice, you cannot fail me." "*That* (is) *it* (or, 'that is so') upon my faith," said the knight.

From the point of view of syntax, not only is *-il* illogical, but also *o*; that is to say, if *oie* were substituted for *oïl* we should still be unable to translate literally, for evidently "*that I* (will)" answering the assertion "you cannot" would give a meaning contrary to what is intended. An exactly logical answer would seem to be *naie*, "you cannot" "*not I*." *Oïl* is in this context far from its original meaning, but is nevertheless quite the natural form, the *-il* being neuter: "that (which you say) is so (it)."

This will perhaps explain why *oïl* was for a long time thought to be derived from HOC ILLUD, meaning originally 'that is it.' This conception, as the present chapter has tried to show, was far from being correct, yet there undoubtedly came a time when *oïl*, in certain contexts, did finally have this signification. It is given here as being *one* very important reason to be added to those already advanced for *oïl* becoming the general or 'regular' affirmative in French.

6. Nenil

The corresponding negative *nenil* develops in a manner quite parallel to the affirmative *oïl*: it was logical in answering a question which demanded a masculine pronoun of the third person singular or plural, and the neuter pronoun *il*. It too became the generalized negative form, and remained as such in literary use as late as the eighteenth century. We therefore can add nothing in regard to it that has not already been said in connection with *oïl*. The following examples are appended to fill out the negative paradigm, and for convenient illustration:

I. Third person singular:

"Donc a nom Turnus tes amis?"
"*Nenil*, dame, gel vos plevis."
—*Eneas*, 8551-2.

"Is your friend called Turnus, then?" "*Not he*, I swear to you."

"Dont ne li manda *il* par vous
Aucunes paroles d'amors?"
"*Nenil*" dist Blancandins, "par foi."
—*Blancandin*, 3815-7.

"Did he not send any message of love by you?" "*Not he*, on my faith."

II. Third person plural:

Ne quidies mie que les ronces et les espines l'esparnaiscent. *Nenil* nient.

—*Auc. et Nic.*

"Think not that the thorns or briars spared him. *Not they* in the least."

III. *Nenil* in answer to an impersonal construction:

"Maistres, m'en estuet il gesir?"
"*Nenil*, ja pour chou n'en gerres."
—*Le jeu de la Feuillée*, 236-7.

"Is it necessary for me to lie down?" "*Not it.*"

Nennil, pronounced *nani*, is still the regular dialectal form of the negative particle in many parts of France, both north and south. A complete demonstration of this modern survival of the negative particle of Old French is given in the *Atlas linguistique*, fasc. 922.

CHAPTER IV

The Affirmative in Old French

(si, si fait)

Modern French regularly employs the affirmative particle *si* in answer to questions which are negative in form, or in affirmations which contradict a negative statement. Thus *si* is restricted to special contexts and cannot be called the "official" French affirmative particle. The more emphatic locution *si fait* is employed in exactly the same way as *si*:

> "Et n'ai-je pas le droit de chercher à connaitre
> Celui qui prétendait dormir sous ma fenêtre?"
> "*Si fait.*"
>
> —Coppée, *Le passant.*
>
> "Vous n'avez pas tué vous-même cet animal."
> "*Si fait,*" lui dis-je.
>
> —Montesquieu: *Lettres persanes* xlii.

The use of *si* (SIC) in affirmative locutions has already been discussed in connection with the Latin affirmatives. As SIC is commonly found in Terence, and sometimes in Plautus, we see that *si* is a much older form of affirmation than *oïl*. Its historical development, too, can be more easily traced. Examples from the *Formulae Antiquae in usum regni italici*[1] show how it was used with a repetition of the verb in the question to form an affirmative locution: "DICIS TU ITA?" "SIC DICO;" then later with a vicarious verb, "SPONDES ITA?" "SIC FACIO."

By the time of the earliest French literature SIC has been reduced to *si* but its development into an affirmative particle is not yet accomplished; it is still at the

[1] See above, p. 25.

stage of an affirmative locution. That is to say, it cannot stand alone in the sense of 'yes,' but requires a verb (which by the time of the Old French period is regularly a vicarious verb) to complete its sense. This tardiness in development is doubtless due to the fact that affirmation in Old French was for the most part expressed by *oïl*. In Spanish and Italian, on the other hand, the absence of any such affirmative as *oïl* results in *si* becoming the general affirmative particle in those languages much earlier than it reached a corresponding stage of development in French. We have, therefore, to deal with affirmative locutions presenting aspects which vary to a considerable extent, in studying the position of *si* in Old French.

First, there is the combination of *si* plus a vicarious verb, the pronoun subject of the verb being expressed to indicate agreement or compliance, approval or corroboration:

"Sire Willame, un petit m'atendez!
Icez couarz que vus ici veez
Ceste est ma torche, mun pople, e mun barnez.
E mei e els en la pointe metez,
Contre les lances aguz des Esclers."
"*Si ferai jo*," dist Willame li bers.
—*La Chançun de Willame*, 2976-81.

"Put them and me to the sword, against the sharp lances of the Slavs." "*So I will do*," said William.

"Donez congié a vostre pere
Que, foi que doi l'âme ma mere,
Je ne mengerai mes des denz
Tant com je le saurai ceenz,
Ainz vueil que li donez congié."
"Dame" fet -il, "*si ferai-gié*."
—*La Houce partie*, 227-282.

"Send your father away, for I swear never to eat another bite as long as I know he is here. . . ." "Lady, *so will I do*."

"Il semble qu'il vienne vers nous."
"*Si fait il*."
—*M. du V.T.*, 15423-4.

This locution expressing compliance generally required the pronoun subject.[1] It finally weakens so as sometimes to lose all semblance of a direct response:

3e Bourgeois: Je vois le sermon escouter
Qu'ay oy maintenant sonner.
2e Bourgeois: *Si faisons nous*, par saint Denis.
—*Miracle de l'empereur Julien* (*Anc. tex.* 2: 185).

the sense being merely "let us do so." This use of *si* does not survive in Modern French, *si* being replaced by the neuter pronoun *le*; thus *si faisons nous* is to-day *faisons-le*.[2] The above examples show that when there is no negation in the preceding question or request, the subject of the verb in the *si* locution is expressed.[3] This is what usually happens with the exception of a few instances in which *si* is used in place of *oïl* (generalised form):

Diabolus: Orras-me tu?
Eva: *Si frai* bien.
—*Mystère d'Adam.*

---

[1] We find it without the pronoun subject, however, in the *Mystère d'Adam:*

Able: Riches hom es e mult as bestes.
Chaim: *Si ai.*

[2] This more modern locution is already to be found in the *Mystère du viel testament:*

". . . gardez que ne faillez pas
qu'il ne soit mis soudain a mort."
"*Je le feray*, soit droit, soit tort." 33739-41.

[3] Although *si* in this sense disappears in French through the final establishment of *oïl* as affirmative particle, it has remained in Spanish in parallel affirmative locutions:

Puede ser verdad? *Si es.*
—Calderon, *El medico de su honra*

and similarly expressing compliance with a command or request:

Aqui te sienta, Fénix.
Si haré.
—*El principe constante.*
Haz lo que manda tu amo.
Si haré.
—*El Alcalde de Zalamea.*

The case in which the pronoun subject of the vicarious verb in locutions with *si* is regularly omitted presents characteristics that are the exact contrary to the locutions with the pronoun.[1] Here an emphatic contradiction is expressed in answer to a negative statement or question. It is from this locution that the modern affirmatives *si* and *si fait* are derived. During the Old French period *faire* had not come to be used vicariously for *avoir* and *estre* after *si*:

"Beau mestre, *n'ai point* de m'espee."
"*Si as*, que je l'ai aportee."
—*Tristran* (Béroul), 1009-10.

"Fair sir, I have no sword." "*Yes you have*, for I have brought it."

". . . de ce n'i a riens eü."
"*Si a*," ce dist li dus, "par m'ame."[2]
—*La Chastelaine de Vergi*, 229-30.

"There has never been anything like that." "*Yes, there has*."

"Saces ke tu n'en r'auras mie."
"*Si arai*," fait Mousès, "biax sire."
—*Le Meunier d'Arleux*, 346-7.

"You will not have a bit of it." "*Yes, I shall*."

Or, *si* in conjunction with *estre*:

"Mors n'est-il encore pas."
"*Si est*, car tout veraiement
Le sai."
—*Li Chev. as .ii. espees*, 3617.

---

[1] See Alfred Schulze: *Zeits. f. rom. Phil.*, 20: 404-5, for a brief *résumé* of these *si* locutions: "Wenn *si* oder *non* in Verbindung mit einem verbum vicarium (*faire, avoir, estre*) die Erwiderung auf eine vorangehende Aeusserung bilden, so bringen die Formen mit ausgesetztem pron. Subjekt das Einverständnis des Redenden mit der vorangehenden Rede zum Ausdruck, während die selben Sätze ohne personal pron. Subjekt die gegenteilige Meinung des Redenden kund thun."

[2] Cf. Calderon, *La Vida es Sueño:* "no ay reparo a su saña." "Si ay." Although *si* is the regular affirmative particle in Spanish, *si* is not here a particle, properly speaking, but part of a locution parallel to the similar expression in Old French.

"He is not yet dead." "*Yes, he is* for I know it to be so."

"Ne je ne sui mie a deus doie
d'amer dame si souveraine,
se je bien i metoie paine."
"*Si estes*," fet el, "se devient."
—*La Chastelaine de Vergi*, 78-81.

"Nor am I at all capable (within two fingers' breadth) of loving such a high born lady." "*Yes you are*, perhaps," says she.

It does not appear that *faire* was ever used vicariously for either *avoir* or *estre* in Old French as long as the verb remained as a verb in the minds of the people. The expressions *si est*, *si as*, etc., are understood literally as the tense and person in these locutions signify, but there comes a time when one word suffices where two were originally used (a not uncommon phenomenon in language)[1] and *si* finally stands by itself an affirmative particle as we have it to-day.[2] The case of *si* in conjunction with *faire* presents characteristics of special interest on account of the curious survival of the third person singular form in Modern French. The reason why *faire* survived while *estre* and *avoir* disappeared may be that *faire* was used in a far greater variety of contexts than were *avoir* and *estre*. In view of the fact that but one form of *faire* remains in the Modern French affirmative particle corresponding to this former affirmative locution, it is interesting to note how per-

[1] Cf. Bell, *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction*.

[2] It is difficult to determine an approximate date at which this process was finally completed, especially as these expressions, being more and more relegated to popular speech, become rare in literary language. The following example of *si* plus *être* belongs to the middle of the sixteenth century:

"De crainte et de ioye ie tremble:
De ioye, pour ce bonheur ci:
De crainte, *qu'il ne soit ainsi.*"
"*Si est.*"
—Jodelle, *Eugène*, V, 4.

fectly this locution fitted the context originally. In the future tense, for instance, each form of *faire* is clearly in its proper context.
First person singular:

> Souvent disoit: "Or i *irai*;
> Non ferai, voir—voir, *si ferai.*"
> —*Li Biaus Desconneus.*

"I shall go," he would say: "No, I shall not—*yes indeed I shall.*"

or again, this time in the first half of the sixteenth century:[1]

> "Je ne *parlerai* donc meshuy.
> *Si feray*, par Diane."
> —*Cymbalum Mundi.*

Second person singular:

> "Jà por cel ne te hucherai
> Ne là por ce ne te dirai
> Que Moriax vuille avainne n'orge."
> "*Si feras*, car jel te comment."
> —*L'Aveine pour Morel.*

"And for that I shall not tell you whether Morel wishes oats or barley." "*Yes you will*, for I command you so to do."
Third person singular:

> ". . . par Mahon! il ne vos remanra."
> Karles respont: "Se Deu plaist *si fera.*"
> —*Aspremont*, 5975-6.

---

[1] This locution with the future is in literary use as late as the seventeenth century. Cf. La Fontaine *Fables* 9: 16:

> "Quoi!" dit-il, "sans mourir je perdrai cette somme!
> Je ne me pendrai pas! et vraiement *si ferai*,
> Ou de corde je manquerai."

Littré says (under *si*) that the expression *si ferai* is still sometimes used. In this passage of La Fontaine it is used to imitate the language of a peasant.

The plural is exactly similar.[1] The following illustrate this locution in the past tense:

"Jamais il ne nous offença."
"*Si fist.*"
—*Mystère du Viel Testament*, 17370-1

"He never offended us." "*Yes he did.*"

"Ersoir menjas tu une andoille,
C'onques rien ne m'en departis."
"Par mon chief," dist li. . . . "*Si fis*,
Je t'en donai." "Non feis, voir."
"*Si fis*, saches le tu de voir."
—*Recueil général*, 2: 134.

The present tense:

"Ne sai? *Si faz*, jel cuit savoir."
—*Cligés*, 665.

"Do I not know it?" "*Yes I do*, I believe I know it."

"Rien ne congnois." "*Si fais.*"[2]
—Villon, *Le débat du cuer et du corps.*

". . . Ne congnoissez vous point
Laban de la lignée Nachor?"
"*Si faisons*, dea."
—*Mystère du Viel Test.*, 13397-9.

"Do you not know Laban?" "*Yes we do.*"

"Il le vous covient a reprendre."
"Non fet"—"*Si fet.*"
—*Le lai de l'ombre*, 794-5.

"It behooves you to take it back." "No it does not." "*Yes it does.*"

"Ne m'enuit, lasse? *Si fait* veir."
—*Eneas*, 9869.

---

[1] The conditional is less usual:

"Ge cuit, que n'en gosteriez."
"*Si feroie.*" "Non feriez."
—*Renart* I, 807-8.

[2] A much later example of *si fais* occurs in Des Periers's translation of the *Andria* of Terence:

"Comment! le sez tu?"
"*Si fais*, vrayment."

Cf. also Marot, *Dialogue de deux amoureux:* Ne me crois tu pas? *Si fais, si.*

"Does it not pain me? *Yes* indeed *it does.*"

These last two examples illustrate the only form of the verb which exists to-day, but here they appear in their proper context. The Old French locution strongly resembles the Modern English expressions "Yes he does, yes I do, etc." as the above examples illustrate: *si as*, "yes you have;" *si est*, "yes he is;" *si ferai*, "yes I shall (do);" *si fis*, "yes I did;" *si faz*, "yes I do;" *si fait*, "yes he does," etc. Thus the Modern French expression *si fait*, being the sole remaining one of all these affirmative locutions,[1] and devoid of its original significance, is equivalent to all these varied interpretations according to the context. For this reason *si fait* is not very exactly understood by most people to-day.[2] Littré, for example, explains it as meaning "ainsi fait," which would be the equivalent of the Latin SIC FACTUM (cf. Italian *siffatto*) and not of the correct derivation SIC FACIT. Brunot (*Grammaire historique*) is vague in his explanation; simply remarking: "de *si* on a fait les locutions voisines: *si fait, que si;*" but in his later work (*Histoire de la langue française*, 3:368) he is more definite, citing an example of *si fais* from the middle of the seventeenth century:

. . . . . notons que cette dernière expression (*si fait*) se figea sous cette forme impersonnelle. Au commencement du XVII[e] siècle, on conjuguait encore le verbe . . . . (see n. 3) . . . "Le Roy, Monsieur, Mademoizelle, Et mainte illustre Jouvencelle, Allèrent je ne sçais pas où. Ha! *si fais*, ce fut à Saint-Clou; (Loret, 15 mars 1659, v. 119-122).

Schulze[3] deals with the Old French locution but does not link it up with the modern affirmative particle.[4] On

[1] With perhaps the exception of *si ferai* (Littré).

[2] M. Lucien Foulet for instance, calls it "une expression vieillotte et incomprise." (*Petite Syntaxe*, page 173).

[3] *Zeits. f. r. Phil.*, 20: 404-5.

[4] As long as the verb idea remains I should call it an affirmative locution, such as it was in Latin for example; once it has come to mean nothing more or less than a contradictory 'yes,' I term it a particle.

the whole, it is a subject that has not received much attention on the part of grammarians.[1]

Before leaving the subject of *si fait*, which, as we have seen, did not as a rule have a pronoun subject, let us examine the following:

"Leisse m'aler." "Vos n'i iroiz."
"*Je si ferai.*" "Vos non feroiz."
—*Erec* (Chrétien de Troyes), 214-5.

"You shall not go." "*Yes I will.*"

"Ne vos vi mais en trestot mon aé."
"*Vos si feistes*," dit Girars l'alosé.
—*Girard de Viane*, p. 42.

"I never saw you in my life before." "*Yes you did.*" These examples can be taken along with one quoted by Schulze (*op. cit.*):

Ne le congnois—Et *je si fas.*
—*Mir. de Notre Dame*, xvi, 1666.

Of this case Schulze says: "From the contêxt it is evident that *je* is an accented pronoun, corresponding to Modern French *moi*. A pause should come after *je*." This opinion seems to be confirmed by the examples from *Erec* and *Girard de Viane*: that the pronouns are disjunctive is shown by the fact that they are separated from the verb by *si*. There is nothing therefore in these examples that can be taken as contradicting the general rule above stated, namely, that the pronoun subject of the verb is not expressed in affirmative locutions in answer to negative questions or statements.

[1] The present chapter has avoided all discussion as to the time at which *si fait* came to be used vicariously for *si*+*avoir* and *si*+*estre*, and the consequent dropping of *avoir* and *estre* from affirmative locutions with *si*. Judging from examples quoted, this development must have taken place about the end of the sixteenth century. In order to settle this question, examples would have to be tabulated from the literature of that period. The writer intends to keep this subject before him and hopes in the future to be able to bring out an article supplementary to this chapter.

In conclusion it may be well to give some possible explanation of the reason why the French language felt the need of developing two distinct particles of affirmation such as *oui* and *si*, but more especially how it came about that *si* to-day is felt to have a value distinct from that of *oui*. Littré says concerning *si*: "On répond *si* et non *oui*, parce que, les phrases étant négatives, on ne saurait si *oui* détruit la négation ou la confirme." This evidently answers the first of these queries; Latin HOC might be used with reference to a complete idea whether affirmative or negative. In *oïl*, answering the question *a-t-il bien fait*? *o* refers to the idea *bien fait*; the pronoun subject *il* is expressed in the affirmative particle, and the verb (being affirmative) is understood. *Oïl*, answering the question *n'a-t-il pas bien fait*? would mean '*that* (=*il n'a pas bien fait*) *he*,' rather than, '*that* (=*il a bien fait*) *he*.' We have already seen that *oïl* could be used to affirm a negative statement (p. 81). In order, therefore, to destroy a negative either in a statement or question, some locution or particle other than *oïl* was necessary.

Littré's explanation does not attempt to make clear the second query. *Sic* as a démonstrative could, equally with HOC refer to an idea that was either affirmative or negative. Why does *si* in answer to the question *n'est-il pas venu*? have the particular meaning it has to-day, e.g., *il est venu*. The answer seems to be in the fact that historically (as we have seen) *si* developed in a locution where the verb, a *verb in the affirmative*, was always expressed. In other words *si* was not originally explanatory in itself, but was accompanied by a verb to make clear its meaning. The above question therefore (*Miracles de N.D.* 2: 323, *Anc. textes fr.*):

> N'est-il pas venu le chemin
> Avecques toy?

is answered in the affirmative by *si est* in contradistinction to *non est*. Used so long in such contexts exclusively and with the verb continually expressed to

complete the meaning, the significance of *si* becomes finally fixed to such an extent that the verb in the locution becomes unnecessary and *si* as a particle retains the significance of the locution. This explanation seems to be borne out by a parallel construction in Spanish. *Si* as affirmative often requires the verb to be expressed to indicate the meaning clearly when answering a negative question:

"No eres Fernando?"
"*Si soy.*"
—*El principe constante.*

. . . "Pues no tendremos
Ingenio para hacer otra mentira?"
"*Si tendreis.*"
—*La dama duende.*

"Ved que no podeis estar
En pie."
"*Si puedo, si puedo.*"
—*El med. de su honra.*

The last example illustrates particularly well the necessity of a verb in conjunction with *si*; *si* alone might or might not destroy the negative in the preceding sentence, while the locution *si puedo* leaves no doubt as to the meaning. In Old French, locutions with *si*, unlike the Spanish affirmative, were limited to a context where it was a case of destroying a negation, and their modern survivals, *si* and *si fait* have retained this particular significance.

CHAPTER V

Conclusion

Comparing the methods of expressing affirmation in Latin with those existing in Old French, we have seen that there was in the latter (a language grown out of the Vulgar Latin of Northern Gaul) a well defined affirmative locution represented by the forms of the *oïl* paradigm, whereas in the Latin language itself there existed no specific form of affirmation. The immediate results of the absence of this in Latin were, that in order to express affirmation, the people used a great variety of locutions; these have been enumerated above (Chapter ii). In Old French, the existence of the *oïl* paradigm which represented a definite, or, so to speak, "official" method of affirmation characteristic of the language, brought about a great reduction in the multiplicity of forms that had been used in Latin. Thus the cumbersome form of affirmation by means of repetition was largely done away with,[1] along with such varied expressions as ITA, ITA VERO, ETIAM, SANE, VALDE, FACTUM EST, etc. In Provençal the affirmative had been reduced simply to *oc* (Latin HOC), but in Old French, the addition of the pronoun subject to this particle had given the affirmative a variety of forms,—forms that were based on one single logical idea (see Chapter iii). Old French, it is true, still retained a few Latin affirmative words such as *certes* (Latin CERTE) or *voir* (Latin VERO):

[1] Sometimes found however where emphasis is required; cf. *Aspremont* (lines 2375-7):

> "Dites, Gorhaut, nel me celés nient:
> Est icis nés de la françoise gent?"
> Et dist Gorhaus: "*Il en est*, voirement."

"Ice feriiez vos por moi?"
Fet mes sire Gauvains, li douz.
"*Certes*, mout seroie or estouz
Si je ceste amande an prenoie."
—*Yvain*, 6292-5.

"Iou et mi frere ensamble o toi irons!"
Dist Naymeris : "*Certes* ce ferons mon."[1]
—*Aliscans*, 2818-9.

"Don estes vos?" "De Grece somes."
"De Grece?" "*Voire.*"
—*Cligés*, 366-7.

These two forms are still current in Modern French though not purely as affirmative particles. *Voir* (the later form being *voire*) is however used as such in the sixteenth century:

"Vous estez morfondue, m'amie?"
"*Voire.*"
Rabelais, *Garg.* V, 15.

"Je te laisse mourir de faim?"
"*Voire*, tu me laisses mourir de faim."
Des Periers, *Cymbalum Mundi.*

As in Latin, Old French used the pronoun to emphasize either affirmation or negation:[2]

"Comment le sez?" "Je l'ai veü."
"Tristran?" "*Je, voire*, et conneü."
—*Tristran* (Béroul), 4295-6.

"As le tu pris?" "*Jo*, par ma foi, *nient.*"
—*Aspremont*, 2381.

Regarding the origin of *oïl* and the other forms of the Old French affirmative paradigm there arises a question which is difficult to decide on account of the lack of evidence. Does *oïl* go back to the Vulgar Latin

[1] *mon*, from Latin MUNDUM 'pure,' is sometimes used with verbs like *savoir*, *estre*, *faire* with affirmative force. Cf. English *clearly*, of similar affirmative meaning.

[2] Cf. the example quoted by Tobler (*Verm. Beit.*, p. 4): "Or di coment." "*Je volentiers.*"

speech or is it a later composition of *o* and *il*? Brunot says in respect to this:

> Originairement *o*, qui correspond à *c'est cela*, avait à lui seul le sens de *oui*. On trouve encore dans *Raoul de Cambrai*, 264: *ne dit ne o ne non*. Mais plus souvent, au lieu de construire ainsi *o* absolument, on le joignait aux pronoms personnels.[1]

Darmesteter to some extent supports this view (see extract quoted above, page 19), and the fact that *oc*, the Provençal form of *o*, was used absolutely as affirmative particle appears as evidence in favour of it. This would mean that the compounding of *o* with *il*, *je*, etc., occurred after HOC had given *o*, ILLI had given *il*, EGO had given *je*, etc.

There is, however, another possibility, namely that *oïl*, *oie*, etc., are the results of a combination of HOC and ILLI, EGO, etc., in other words, that the locution itself goes back to the Folk Latin. We have more than one reason for accepting this possibility. In the first place, if the addition of the personal pronoun took place after *o* had come to mean 'yes' in itself, it is hardly likely that the confusion that existed concerning the meaning of the pronoun would have occurred so early. Or again, if the language had as a matter of fact, once developed an affirmative particle *o*, as Brunot says, it is not likely, in view of what has already been seen in this article, that it would add to this indeclinable part of speech "the subject of a verb (understood)," as it is stated in Darmesteter (see above, p. 19). In the second place the fact that *o* did not tend to become *eu*[2] shows that it had long been pronounced in the atonic position. Meyer-Lübke gives some measure of support to this opinion when he explains *oïl* as coming from *oc-il* through the palatalization of the *c* before *i*,[3] just as *oc* would become *o* before *je*. The presence of Provençal affirma-

[1] *Gram. hist. de la langue française*, p. 560.

[2] For example, in the phrase *ne o ne non*, *o* is never written *eu*.

[3] *Hist. franz. Gram.*, p. 143. See above, p. 72, note 2.

tive forms involving the personal pronouns seems to indicate that here too we have to deal with survivals of earlier Latin forms.[1]

A Latin affirmative locution involving the personal pronoun moreover is not uncommon, as we have already seen:[2] EGO, for example, being used with strong affirmative force in the *Andria* of Terence (above quoted):

"Hocine agis an non?" "*Ego* vero istuc."

To the question, VENIT? therefore it is quite possible that in Gaul the Folk Latin affirmative was HOC ILLI (sc. FACIT). The verb is often suppressed in Latin after SIC and ITA, as we have seen, although it was always understood. As the verbal sense disappears, HOC ILLI would come to be used alone as affirmative.

In the absence of data to prove that Old French *oïl* comes directly from a similar Latin construction (*HOC ILLI) and that 'yes' was not originally expressed by *o* alone as Brunot says, we must leave the reader to accept the one or the other hypothesis. As far as the present study is concerned the question must remain unanswered.[3]

---

[1] It may be objected that these are due to the influence of the Old French forms. As we have seen, however, the general tendency of affirmatives is to reduce: from the multiplicity to the few, and from the extended meaning of the locution to the simple meaning of the particle. It is more likely therefore that the Provençal *oc* is a shortened form of the locutions *o ieu, o il, oc nos* (a shortening dating back of course to the Latin when HOC had not yet reduced to *ó* before a palatal) rather than that *o ieu, oc nos*, etc., are extended forms of *oc*.

[2] See above, p. 35.

[3] Evidence for and against may be given, however. The existence of the affirmative *o* in the expression *ne o ne non* is at first glance in favour of what Brunot and Darmesteter claim. On the other hand this expression is obviously a fixed one, what might be called a stock phase. Outside of it *o* never occurs as affirmative in Old French, and besides, the fact that it does not here answer directly a question means that no pronoun could be attached to it unless it were a neuter pronoun. This impersonal signification of *o* in the expression *ne o ne non* is also indicated by the variant

One fact stands out clearly however as a result of the development of a definite locution of affirmation and that is the continual reduction of affirmative forms. The Old French period marks but a stage in this process, between the Latin and the Modern French. This stage is still properly that of an affirmative locution, where the various forms *oie*, *oïl*, etc., have reference both to the subject-matter and to the particular pronoun subject: that is to say they embrace *two* ideas. With the disappearance of this pronominal signification following that of the earlier disappearance of the verb idea, the affirmative particle becomes still further reduced to a single idea found in the Modern expression *oui*.

This same narrowing down process takes place in the affirmative locutions with *si*, only in this case it occurs at a later period. In Old French the verb was always expressed with the logical inflection required by the context. Thus the Old French expression *si fais* shows no grammatical change from the SIC FACIO quoted above (Chapter ii) as a Latin affirmative. Its use however shows that it is limited to contexts involving the contradiction of a negation.

The disappearance of the verb in the *si* locutions with *estre* and *avoir* has reduced *si* to the simple affirmative particle of Modern French. In the case of *faire* the verb has never entirely disappeared, probably owing to the fact that it must have been used with far greater frequency than either *avoir* or *estre*. We have seen however that with the disappearance of all idea of

form *oal* in a similar context, quoted above (Chap. iii), "n'en dient *oal ne nenil*." Cf. also "or en dites de *voir ou non*," (Christine de Pisan, *Chemin de longue estude*, 3803). And further, what has already been said regarding the Provençal affirmative *oc* would hold good here; the form *o* may just as well be a shortened form of the affirmative locution involving the pronouns, as the original affirmative to which the pronouns were later added. The tendency of both form and meaning to reduce more and more makes the former supposition appear as the more likely.

inflection the verb *faire*, limited to the form of the third person singular of the present indicative, has long since ceased to be felt as a verb at all. Thus *si fait* along with *si* and *oui* (all three being the remains of what were originally Latin locutions of affirmation) has come to be nothing more than a simple affirmative.

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

BELL: *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction.*
BOURCIEZ: *Eléments de linguistique romane.*
BRUNOT: *Grammaire Historique.*
—— *Histoire de la langue française.*
—— *La Pensée et la langue.*
BURGUY: *Grammaire de la langue d'oïl aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles.*
CORNU: See article in *Romania* 9: 117.
DARMESTETER: *Historical French Grammar.* (Hartog's translation).
DARMESTETER, HATZFELD & THOMAS: *Dictionnaire Général.*
DIEZ: *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen.*
FOERSTER: See *Zeitsch. f. r. Phil.* 2: 171.
FOULET: *Petite Syntaxe de l'ancien français.*
GILLIÉRON: *Atlas linguistique.*
GODEFROY: *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français.*
GRIMM: *Deutsche Grammatik.*
HORNING: *Le pronom neutre* il *en langue d'oïl,* (*Rom. Stud.* IV).
KÜHNER: *Ausführliche lat. Gram.*
LITTRÉ: *Dictionnaire de la langue française.*
LANGLOIS: *Le Jeu de la Feuillée* (critical notes).
MEYER-LÜBKE: *Historische franz. Grammatik.*
—— *Grammaire des Langues romanes.*
NYROP: *Grammaire Historique.*
PARIS: *Le pronom neutre de la 3^e personne en français* (*Romania* 23: 161 ff).
PERLE: *Die Negation im Altfranzösichen* (*Zeitsch. f. r. Phil.* ii).
TOBLER: *Französische etymologien* (*Zeitsch. f. verg. Sprachf.*, xxiii).
SCHULZE: See article in *Zeitsch. f. r. Phil.*, 20: 404-5.
WALDE: *Lat. etym. Wörterbuch.*

*The bibliography contains only those works which bear directly on the subject of this dissertation, and omits all titles of works consulted but not utilized.

VITA

The writer was born in Winnipeg, February 25, 1897; he attended Public and High Schools there, and entered the University of Manitoba in the fall of 1913. At the beginning of 1916, while in his third year, majoring in Latin and French, he enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, but completed his studies for the academic year in barracks. Sailing from Canada in May, 1916, he served for fifteen months in France as a stretcher-bearer, his degree of B.A. being conferred *in absentia*. In October, 1917, he was wounded, and did not see active service again until August, 1918, this time as a machine-gunner.

During the period of demobilization he attended Edinburgh University, returning to Canada in August, 1919. The next two years were spent at Columbia University as a graduate student in Romance Languages, where he received the A.M. degree in 1920. Since September, 1921, he has been Lecturer in French at the University of Toronto.